Prepared for submission to JHEP

Open Gauged Sigma Models, Equivariant Branes, and Equivariant Homological Mirror Symmetry

Meer Ashwinkumar and Meng-Chwan Tan

Department of Physics, National University of Singapore
2 Science Drive 3, Singapore 117551

E-mail: meerashwinkumar@u.nus.edu, mctan@nus.edu.sg

Abstract: We describe supersymmetric A-branes and B-branes in open $\mathcal{N} = (2, 2)$ dynamically gauged nonlinear sigma models (GNLSM), placing emphasis on toric manifold target spaces. For a subset of toric manifolds, these equivariant branes have a mirror description as branes in gauged Landau-Ginzburg models with neutral matter. We then study correlation functions in the topological A-twisted version of the GNLSM, and identify their values with open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants. Supersymmetry breaking can occur in the A-twisted GNLSM due to nonpertubative open symplectic vortices, and we canonically quantize the mirror theory to analyze this phenomenon.

arXiv:1612.09191v3 [hep-th] 23 Feb 2017

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 The Gauged Nonlinear Sigma Model with Boundaries **3**

3 GNLSMs from GLSMs and Mirror Symmetry **11**

4 Equivariant B-branes and their Mirrors **21**
- 4.1 Equivariant B-branes on $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$ from GLSM 26
- 4.2 Equivariant B-branes on $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ from GLSM 32
- 4.3 Alternative Formulation 34
- 4.4 Quantum Corrections 38
- 4.5 Mirrors of Equivariant B-branes 40
- 4.6 Nonabelian Equivariant B-branes 44

5 Equivariant A-branes and their Mirrors **47**
- 5.1 Equivariant A-branes on $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$ from GLSM 54
- 5.2 Equivariant A-branes on $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ from GLSM 61
- 5.3 Quantum Corrections 61
- 5.4 Mirrors of Equivariant A-branes 62
- 5.5 Nonabelian Equivariant A-branes 68

6 Open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten Invariants **70**
- 6.1 Open Topological Gauged A-model 71
- 6.2 Observables and Open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten Invariants 73
- 6.3 Dimension of Moduli Space of Open Symplectic Vortices and R-anomaly 77
- 6.4 $\hat{Q}_A^2 \neq 0$ Anomaly 81
- 6.5 Mirror Computation of Abelian Invariants 89

1 Introduction

D-branes are crucial to the nonpertubative dynamics of string theory, and their importance has been well-understood since Polchinski [1] identified them with black p-brane solutions of supergravity. From the point of view of mathematics, D-branes are essential objects of homological mirror symmetry, first conjectured by Kontsevich [2].

In this paper, we investigate D-branes of dynamically gauged nonlinear sigma models (GNLSMs) with $\mathcal{N} = (2, 2)$ supersymmetry, which we shall refer to as equivariant branes. One motivation for this is that GNLSMs with target space X and gauge group G flow in the IR limit to nonlinear sigma models (NLSMs) with target space $X//G$, and hence, we will

obtain new descriptions of D-branes in $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ NLSMs, including those with Calabi-Yau targets used in realistic compactifications of string theory. A more mathematically oriented motivation is furnishing an *equivariant* generalization of homological mirror symmetry. As we shall see, describing equivariant branes will also allow us to define an *open* version of the mathematical theory of Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants [29–31].

The $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ dynamically gauged nonlinear sigma model (GNLSM) governing maps from a closed Riemann surface into a Kähler manifold X with Hamiltonian isometry group G was studied in depth by Baptista [3, 13]. In particular, it was shown that the A-twisted GNLSM localizes to the moduli space of symplectic vortices, and its correlation functions compute the Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants of X. Moreover, for abelian G, Baptista used mirror symmetry (as proven by Hori and Vafa [10]) to describe the quantum equivariant cohomology ring for toric X.

D-branes in $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ NLSMs on open Riemann surfaces have also been studied by Hori, Iqbal and Vafa [11, 12], with the mirrors of these D-branes also being identified. We are thus led to attempt an understanding of equivariant branes by combining the insights described above, that is, by analyzing $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ GNLSMs on open Riemann surfaces and their mirrors. Since only a subset of the $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ supersymmetry can be preserved at the boundaries of these open Riemann surfaces, we are led to two types of equivariant branes, namely equivariant A-branes and equivariant B-branes.

Equivariant B-branes have been previously studied by Kapustin et al. [15] within the context of topologically B-twisted GNLSMs, although the mirrors of these branes were not elucidated. On the other hand, equivariant A-branes have only been studied for $G = U(1)$ by Setter [17], using the topologically A-twisted non-dynamical $U(1)$-GNLSM; in this case, their mirrors were not elucidated either. We shall study both types of equivariant branes, and provide the description of their mirrors in a subset of toric target spaces, hence defining equivariant homological mirror symmetry in these contexts. In addition, understanding equivariant A-branes allows us to define open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants, which can be understood as integrals over the moduli space of open symplectic vortices that describe a map from an open Riemann surface Σ to a Kähler and Hamiltonian G-manifold X, whereby the boundaries of Σ correspond to equivariant A-branes in X. We note that closed Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants have been studied extensively in the mathematical literature [29–31]. However, the open invariants have been largely unexplored, with the exception of the work of Xu [33], which concerns the compactification of the moduli space of open symplectic vortices on the disk for $G = U(1)$.

An outline of the paper

In Section 2, we introduce the $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ supersymmetric dynamically gauged nonlinear sigma model on the infinite strip, focusing on its gauge symmetry and supersymmetry. In Section 3, we review the mirror symmetry between abelian GNLSMs and gauged Landau-Ginzburg (LG) models with neutral matter, and elucidate the explicit reduction of open gauged linear sigma models (GLSMs) to open GNLSMs, making use of the example of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$. In Section 4, we study equivariant B-branes, paying particular attention to abelian equivariant B-branes in toric manifolds X, as well as the LG mirrors of these branes when

X is Fano. Nonabelian equivariant B-branes in general G-manifolds are also analyzed. In Section 5, abelian equivariant A-branes in toric manifolds X are introduced, and their LG mirror description is shown for toric manifolds X with $c_1(X) \geq 0$. We also explore nonabelian equivariant A-branes for general G-manifolds. In Section 6, we use the data of equivariant A-branes to study open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants. The open gauged A-model is first introduced, together with its bulk and boundary observables. The path integrals of these observables are given by classical integrals over the moduli space of open symplectic vortices on a Riemann surface with boundaries, and these integrals are identified with the open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants. Then, we compute the dimension of this moduli space, as well as the related axial R-anomaly. For abelian invariants, we use mirror symmetry to compute the $\hat{Q}_A^2 \neq 0$ anomaly, which obstructs integration over the moduli space, and also implies supersymmetry breaking. We shall find the condition whereby the anomaly vanishes and supersymmetry is manifest. Finally, we show how mirror symmetry can be used to compute the abelian invariants themselves.

The reader who is interested in equivariant B-branes should read Sections 2, 3 and 4, whereas the reader who is interested in equivariant A-branes and open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants should read Sections 2, 3, 5 and 6.

2 The Gauged Nonlinear Sigma Model with Boundaries

The $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ supersymmetric nonlinear sigma model (NLSM) has the isometry group, G of its Kähler target space, X, as a global symmetry. This global symmetry can be gauged, by allowing the isometry transformations of the target space to depend on the local coordinates of the worldsheet. As in the case of Yang-Mills theory, invariance under this local symmetry requires the introduction of a gauge field, A_μ. Supersymmetry then requires the introduction of gaugino and scalar fields, denoted as λ and σ. In addition, we can introduce kinetic terms for the gauge field and its superpartners, and as a result we have a dynamically gauged supersymmetric nonlinear sigma model, or GNLSM.

We shall take the worldsheet Σ to be the infinite strip $I \times \mathbb{R}$ (where the interval is $I = [0, \pi]$) equipped with a flat Minkowski metric $\eta = \mathrm{diag}(-1, 1)$. The spatial coordinate along the interval will be denoted x^1 and the time coordinate parametrizing $\mathbb{R}$ will be denoted x^0. The main fields of the GNLSM are a connection, A, on a principal G-bundle

$$P \to \Sigma, \tag{2.1}$$

and a section

$$\phi : \Sigma \to E \tag{2.2}$$

of the associated bundle $E := P \times_G X$, , where X is a Kähler manifold. A local patch of E looks like the product $\Sigma \times X$, which implies that locally the section ϕ looks like a map $\phi : \Sigma \to X$,[1] as one finds in non-gauged NLSMs.

[1]When P is the trivial G-bundle, this becomes true *globally*.

The other fields of the GNLSM are sections of the following bundles [3]:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\pm &\in \Gamma(\Sigma; S_\pm \otimes \phi^* \ker d\pi_E) & F &\in \Gamma(\Sigma; \phi^* \ker d\pi_E) \\ \sigma &\in \Gamma(\Sigma; \mathfrak{g}_P^{\mathbb{C}}) & D &\in \Gamma(\Sigma; \mathfrak{g}_P) \\ \lambda_\pm &\in \Gamma(\Sigma; S_\pm \otimes \mathfrak{g}_P^{\mathbb{C}}) \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Here, $S_\pm = K^{\pm 1/2}$ are the spinor bundles of Σ, whereby $K = \Lambda^{1,0}\Sigma$ is the canonical bundle of Σ (the bundle of one-forms of type (1,0)); $\ker d\pi_E \to E$ is a bundle which locally looks like $\Sigma \times TX \to \Sigma \times X$, and is the sub-bundle of $TE \to E$ corresponding to the kernel of the derivative $\mathrm{d}\pi_E : TE \to T\Sigma$ of the projection $\pi_E : E \to \Sigma$; $\phi^*(\ker d\pi_E) \to \Sigma$ is the pullback of $\ker d\pi_E$ with respect to the section ϕ; and $\mathfrak{g}_P := P \times_{\mathrm{Ad}} \mathfrak{g}$ is the associated adjoint bundle (where $\mathfrak{g}$ is the Lie algebra of G) with $\mathfrak{g}_P^{\mathbb{C}}$ denoting its complexification.

The GNLSM action is

$$S = \frac{1}{2\pi}(S_{\text{matter}} + S_{\text{gauge}} + S_B + S_\theta), \tag{2.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{matter}} = \int_\Sigma d^2x \Big(& - g_{j\overline{k}} \partial_\mu^A \phi^j \partial^{A\mu} \overline{\phi}^{\overline{k}} \ + \ \frac{i}{2}\, g_{j\overline{k}}\, \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{k}}\, (\phi^* \overleftrightarrow{\nabla}^A)_+ \psi_-^j \ + \ \frac{i}{2}\, g_{j\overline{k}}\, \overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{k}}\, (\phi^* \overleftrightarrow{\nabla}^A)_- \psi_+^j \\ & - \ \frac{1}{2} g_{j\overline{k}} \sigma^a \widetilde{e}_a^j \overline{\sigma}^b \overline{\widetilde{e}}_b^{\overline{k}} \ - \ \frac{1}{2} g_{j\overline{k}} \overline{\sigma}^a \widetilde{e}_a^j \sigma^b \overline{\widetilde{e}}_b^{\overline{k}} \ + \ i g_{j\overline{k}}\, (\nabla_l \widetilde{e}_a^j)\, (\sigma^a \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{k}} \psi_+^l \ + \ \overline{\sigma}^a \overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{k}} \psi_-^l) \\ & + \ g_{j\overline{k}} (\overline{\lambda}_+^a\, \widetilde{e}_a^j\, \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{k}} \ - \ \overline{\lambda}_-^a\, \widetilde{e}_a^j\, \overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{k}} \ - \ \lambda_+^a\, \overline{\widetilde{e}}_a^{\overline{k}}\, \psi_-^j \ + \ \lambda_-^a\, \overline{\widetilde{e}}_a^{\overline{k}}\, \psi_+^j) \\ & + \ R_{i\overline{j}k\overline{l}}\, \psi_+^i \psi_-^k\, \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{j}}\, \overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{l}} \ + \ g_{j\overline{k}} (F^j \ - \ \Gamma_{il}^j\, \psi_+^i \psi_-^l)(\overline{F}^{\overline{k}} \ - \ \Gamma_{\overline{m}\overline{n}}^{\overline{k}}\, \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{m}}\, \overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{n}}) \Big), \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{gauge}} = \frac{1}{2e^2} \int_\Sigma d^2x \Big(& F_{01}^a F_{01a} \ - \ \partial_\mu^A \sigma^a \partial^{A\mu} \overline{\sigma}_a \ - \ \frac{1}{4}\, [\sigma, \overline{\sigma}]^a [\sigma, \overline{\sigma}]_a \ + \ D^a D_a \ - \ 2\, e^2\, \phi^* \mu_a\, D^a \\ & + \ \frac{i}{2}\, (\overline{\lambda}_-)_a \overleftrightarrow{\nabla}_+^A \lambda_-^a \ + \ \frac{i}{2}\, (\overline{\lambda}_+)_a \overleftrightarrow{\nabla}_-^A \lambda_+^a \ + \ i\, \overline{\lambda}_-^a [\sigma, \lambda_+]_a \ + \ i\, \overline{\lambda}_+^a [\overline{\sigma}, \lambda_-]_a \Big)\ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

$$S_B = -\int_\Sigma \phi^* B \ + \int_{\partial\Sigma} \phi^* C_a A^a, \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$S_\theta = \int_\Sigma d^2x\ \ (\theta, F_{01}) \tag{2.8}$$

with $d^2x = dx^1 \wedge dx^0$.[2] Here, F^j and D^a are auxiliary fields. The covariant derivatives induced by the connection A on the bundles E, $\phi^* \ker d\pi_E$ and $\mathfrak{g}_P$ over Σ appear above in their local forms, which are given explicitly as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\mu^A \phi^k &= \partial_\mu \phi^k + A_\mu^a\, \widetilde{e}_a^k \\ (\phi^* \nabla^A)_\mu \psi^k &= \partial_\mu \psi^k + A_\mu^a \psi^j \partial_j \widetilde{e}_a^k + \Gamma_{jl}^k (\partial_\mu^A \phi^j) \psi^l \\ \nabla_\mu^A \sigma^a &= \partial_\mu \sigma^a + [A_\mu, \sigma]^a \\ \nabla_\mu^A \lambda^a &= \partial_\mu \lambda^a + [A_\mu, \lambda]^a \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

[2] We only consider the case where G is compact, in order to ensure positive-definiteness of the gauge multiplet kinetic terms.

where ϕ and σ are locally regarded as maps $\Sigma \to X$ and $\Sigma \to \mathfrak{g}$; ψ and λ are locally regarded as (fermionic) maps $\Sigma \to \phi^* TX$ and $\Sigma \to \mathfrak{g}$; and A is regarded as a local 1-form on Σ. We have also used the notations

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_+ &= \nabla_0 + \nabla_1 \\ \nabla_- &= \nabla_0 - \nabla_1, \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

as well as

$$A \overleftrightarrow{\nabla} B = A\nabla B - B\nabla A. \tag{2.11}$$

The notation (2.11) appears in all the fermionic kinetic terms, since they must have this symmetrized form in order to preserve the hermiticity of the action in the presence of worldsheet boundaries.

Let us now explain the quantities that appear in the action. Firstly, note that the components of the Killing vector fields

$$\widetilde{e}_a = \widetilde{e}_a^i \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi^i} + \overline{\widetilde{e}}_a^{\overline{\jmath}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \overline{\phi}^{\overline{\jmath}}} \tag{2.12}$$

which generate the G-isometry of X appear in the action. These components are holomorphic/antiholomorphic,

$$\frac{\partial \overline{\widetilde{e}}_a^{\overline{\jmath}}}{\partial \phi^i} = \frac{\partial \widetilde{e}_a^i}{\partial \overline{\phi}^{\overline{\jmath}}} = 0, \tag{2.13}$$

and this constraint can be shown to be a consequence of the complex structure of X being G-invariant, i.e., $\mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}} J = 0$. Furthermore, they realize an antihomomorphism of the Lie algebra, $\mathfrak{g}$, via their Lie bracket

$$[\widetilde{e}_a, \widetilde{e}_b] = -i f_{ab}^c \widetilde{e}_c. \tag{2.14}$$

Also note that the covariant derivative of the holomorphic component, $\nabla_l \widetilde{e}_a^j$ appears in the action.

The moment map μ_a, which is a map $X \to \mathfrak{g}^*$ (where $\mathfrak{g}^*$ is the dual of $\mathfrak{g}$) also appears in (2.6), and obeys

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\overline{k}} \mu_a &= i g_{j\overline{k}} \widetilde{e}_a^j \\ \partial_k \mu_a &= -i g_{\overline{j}k} \overline{\widetilde{e}}_a^{\overline{\jmath}} \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

or

$$d\mu_a = \iota_{\widetilde{e}_a} \omega, \tag{2.16}$$

where $\omega = \frac{1}{2}\omega_{IJ} d\phi^I \wedge d\phi^J = i g_{i\overline{\jmath}} d\phi^i \wedge d\overline{\phi}^{\overline{\jmath}}$ is the Kähler form.[3] This indicates that the G-isometry of X is Hamiltonian.

The fact that only the *derivative* of μ_a enters (2.16) ostensibly implies that the moment map $\mu = \mu_a T^a$ is only defined up to a constant in $\mathfrak{g}^*$. In fact, the moment map is defined up to a constant in $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]^0$, the subspace of $\mathfrak{g}^*$ that annihilates commutators;[4] as in [3], we

[3] In [3], the the moment map equation is given as $2\partial_{\overline{k}} \mu_a = i g_{j\overline{k}} \widetilde{e}_a^j$, since the Kähler form is defined as $\omega = \frac{i}{2} g_{i\overline{\jmath}} d\phi^i \wedge d\overline{\phi}^{\overline{\jmath}}$.

[4] $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]^0$ can be further identified with the centre of $\mathfrak{g}$, via the identification $\mathfrak{g}^* \cong \mathfrak{g}$ provided by the inner product $\mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g} \to \mathbb{R}$.

shall follow the convention of ([4], page 164) where the definition of a Hamiltonian G-action includes the additional condition

$$\rho_g^* \mu = \mathrm{Ad}_g^* \circ \mu \tag{2.17}$$

for all elements $g \in G$. Here, ρ is the G-action on X and Ad^* is the coadjoint representation on $\mathfrak{g}^*$. This then implies ([5], page 190) that the moment map is only defined up to a constant, r, in $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]^0$. In fact, this freedom to redefine the moment map as

$$\mu \to \mu + r \tag{2.18}$$

is manifest in the action; we may add the term

$$S_r = \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{1}{2e^2}\int_\Sigma d^2x(-2e^2 r_a D^a) = -\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma d^2x\ r_a D^a \tag{2.19}$$

to (2.4), which results in

$$\mu_a \to \mu_a + r_a \tag{2.20}$$

in (2.6). From (2.19), we see that the constant r now plays the role of a $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]^0$-valued Fayet-Iliopoulos (FI) parameter.

In (2.7), the B-field action is given. Here, B is an arbitrary G-invariant (i.e., $\mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}}B = 0$) and closed 2-form on X, and ϕ^*B denotes the pullback of B. Explicitly, the B-field term is denoted as

$$-\phi^*B = -\frac{1}{2}B_{IJ}(\partial_1\phi^I\partial_0\phi^J - \partial_0\phi^I\partial_1\phi^J)dx^1\wedge dx^0, \tag{2.21}$$

where $B = \frac{1}{2}B_{IJ}d\phi^I\wedge d\phi^J$, and ϕ^I are real coordinates on X. A boundary term [6] is also included in the B-field action, with

$$\phi^*C_aA^a = \phi^*C_aA_0^a dx^0, \tag{2.22}$$

where C is a map $X\to\mathfrak{g}^*$ which obeys

$$dC_a = \iota_{\widetilde{e}_a}B. \tag{2.23}$$

The necessity of this boundary term will be explained below when we investigate the gauge invariance of the B-field action.

Finally, the θ-term is given in (2.8), where θ is a constant in $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]^0\subset\mathfrak{g}^*$, while $(\cdot,\cdot)$ is the inner product $\mathfrak{g}^*\times\mathfrak{g}\to\mathbb{R}$. We can then combine r with θ as

$$r - i\theta = t \in [\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]^0_{\mathbb{C}}, \tag{2.24}$$

to obtain the complex FI-theta parameter, t, valued in $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]^0_{\mathbb{C}}$ (the complexification of $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]^0$).

Gauge and Supersymmetry Invariance

The action is invariant under the following gauge symmetry transformations (where the parameter α^a is a local function on the worldsheet)[5]

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\phi^k &= \alpha^a \widetilde{e}_a^k \\
\delta\overline{\phi}^{\overline{k}} &= \alpha^a \widetilde{\overline{e}}_a^{\overline{k}} \\
\delta\psi_\pm^k &= \alpha^a \psi_\pm^i \partial_i \widetilde{e}_a^k \\
\delta\overline{\psi}_\pm^{\overline{k}} &= \alpha^a \overline{\psi}_\pm^{\overline{i}} \partial_{\overline{i}} \widetilde{\overline{e}}_a^{\overline{k}} \\
\delta F^k &= \alpha^a F^i \partial_i \widetilde{e}_a^k \\
\delta\overline{F}^{\overline{k}} &= \alpha^a \overline{F}^{\overline{i}} \partial_{\overline{i}} \widetilde{\overline{e}}_a^{\overline{k}}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta A_\mu^a &= [\alpha, A_\mu]^a - \partial_\mu \alpha^a = -\nabla_\mu^A \alpha^a \\
\delta\sigma^a &= [\alpha, \sigma]^a \\
\delta\overline{\sigma}^a &= [\alpha, \overline{\sigma}]^a \\
\delta\lambda_\pm^a &= [\alpha, \lambda_\pm]^a \\
\delta\overline{\lambda}_\pm^a &= [\alpha, \overline{\lambda}_\pm]^a \\
\delta D^a &= [\alpha, D]^a
\end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

Let us first explain how gauge invariance requires the boundary term in the B-field action (2.7), following ([6], page 28). For a closed worldsheet, the term containing the closed two-form $\phi^* B$ is gauge invariant. However, on an open worldsheet, a gauge transformation of this term generates a boundary term, and in order to restore gauge invariance, the boundary term containing $\phi^* C$ must be added to the action.

With the exception of this B-field action (2.7), the gauge symmetry of the action is insensitive to the presence of a boundary. To understand this, note that for a *global* G-isometry of X, the corresponding symmetry variation of the (non-gauged) NLSM scalar kinetic term is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Sigma d^2x \ \delta(g_{i\overline{j}} \partial_\mu \phi^i \partial^\mu \overline{\phi}^{\overline{j}}) \\
=&\int_\Sigma d^2x \ (\partial_k g_{i\overline{j}} \widetilde{e}_a^k + \partial_{\overline{k}} g_{i\overline{j}} \widetilde{\overline{e}}_a^{\overline{k}} + g_{k\overline{j}} \partial_i \widetilde{e}_a^k + g_{i\overline{k}} \partial_j \widetilde{\overline{e}}_a^{\overline{k}}) \alpha^a \partial_\mu \phi^i \partial^\mu \overline{\phi}^{\overline{j}} \\
=&\int_\Sigma d^2x \ \mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}} g_{i\overline{j}} \partial_\mu \phi^i \partial^\mu \overline{\phi}^{\overline{j}} \\
=&0,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

where we have used the Killing equation $\mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}} g_{i\overline{j}} = 0$. In the computation above, we have not used integration-by-parts (which would introduce a nonzero boundary term), so the presence of a boundary is inconsequential for global G-symmetry of NLSMs.

A crucial step in (2.27) is that the worldsheet derivative of ϕ^i transforms under the global G-symmetry as a target space vector field, i.e.,

$$\delta(\partial_\mu \phi^i) = \alpha^a \partial_\mu \phi^j \partial_j \widetilde{e}_a^i. \tag{2.28}$$

[5]Note that one needs to use various identities in order to show gauge invariance, including the Jacobi identity and the Killing equation $\mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}} g_{i\overline{j}} = 0$, which implies $\mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}} \Gamma_{jk}^i = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}} R_{i\overline{j}k\overline{l}} = 0$ ([7], page 52).

When the G-symmetry is *local*, it is the *covariant* derivative that transforms in the above manner, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta(\partial_\mu^A \phi^i) &= \partial_\mu(\alpha^a \widetilde{e}_a^i) - \nabla_\mu^A \alpha^a \widetilde{e}_a^i + A^a \alpha^b \widetilde{e}_a^j \partial_j e_b^i + A_\mu^a [\alpha, \widetilde{e}^i]_a \\ &= \alpha^a \partial_\mu^A \phi^j \partial_j \widetilde{e}_a^i\end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

Then, the same steps in the computation (2.27) hold, with $g_{i\overline{\jmath}}\partial_\mu \phi^i \partial^\mu \overline{\phi^j}$ replaced by $g_{i\overline{\jmath}}\partial_\mu^A \phi^i \partial^{A\mu} \overline{\phi^j}$, and the scalar kinetic term of the GNLSM is gauge invariant without using integration-by-parts. In a similar manner, all the other terms in (2.5) are gauge invariant without the generation of nonzero boundary terms via integration-by-parts. Furthermore, the gauge action (2.6), the θ-term in (2.8), and the FI term (2.19) are also gauge invariant, without using integration-by-parts. In this way, the GNLSM action (2.4) is gauge invariant, and no nonzero boundary terms are generated via gauge transformations.

However, this is not the case for supersymmetry. For a closed worldsheet, the action (2.4) would be invariant under the following $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ supersymmetry transformations[6,7]

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\phi^k &= (\epsilon_+ \psi_-^k - \epsilon_- \psi_+^k) \\
\delta\overline{\phi}^{\overline{k}} &= -(\bar{\epsilon}_+ \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{k}} - \bar{\epsilon}_- \overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{k}}) \\
\delta\psi_+^k &= i\bar{\epsilon}_-(\partial_0^A + \partial_1^A)\phi^k + \epsilon_+ F^k + i\bar{\epsilon}_+ \overline{\sigma}^a \widetilde{e}_a^k \\
\delta\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{k}} &= -i\epsilon_-(\partial_0^A + \partial_1^A)\overline{\phi}^{\overline{k}} + \bar{\epsilon}_+ \overline{F}^{\overline{k}} - i\epsilon_+ \sigma^a \widetilde{\overline{e}}_a^{\overline{k}} \\
\delta\psi_-^k &= -i\bar{\epsilon}_+(\partial_0^A - \partial_1^A)\phi^k + \epsilon_- F^k - i\bar{\epsilon}_- \sigma^a \widetilde{e}_a^k \\
\delta\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{k}} &= i\epsilon_+(\partial_0^A - \partial_1^A)\overline{\phi}^{\overline{k}} + \bar{\epsilon}_- \overline{F}^{\overline{k}} + i\epsilon_- \overline{\sigma}^a \widetilde{\overline{e}}_a^{\overline{k}} \\
\delta F^k &= -i\bar{\epsilon}_+(\partial_- \psi_+^k + A_-^a(\partial_j \widetilde{e}_a^k)\psi_+^j) - i\bar{\epsilon}_-(\partial_+ \psi_-^k + A_+^a(\partial_j \widetilde{e}_a^k)\psi_-^j) \\
&\quad + \bar{\epsilon}_- \overline{\lambda}_+^a \widetilde{e}_a^k - \bar{\epsilon}_+ \overline{\lambda}_-^a \widetilde{e}_a^k - i\bar{\epsilon}_+ \overline{\sigma}^a (\partial_j \widetilde{e}_a^k)\psi_-^j - i\bar{\epsilon}_- \sigma^a (\partial_j \widetilde{e}_a^k)\psi_+^j \\
\delta\overline{F}^{\overline{k}} &= -i\epsilon_+(\partial_- \overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{k}} + A_-^a(\partial_{\overline{\jmath}} \widetilde{\overline{e}}_a^{\overline{k}})\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{j}}) - i\epsilon_-(\partial_+ \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{k}} + A_+^a(\partial_{\overline{\jmath}} \widetilde{\overline{e}}_a^{\overline{k}})\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{j}}) \\
&\quad - \epsilon_- \lambda_+^a \widetilde{\overline{e}}_a^{\overline{k}} + \epsilon_+ \lambda_-^a \widetilde{\overline{e}}_a^{\overline{k}} - i\epsilon_+ \sigma^a (\partial_{\overline{\jmath}} \widetilde{\overline{e}}_a^{\overline{k}})\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{j}} - i\epsilon_- \overline{\sigma}^a (\partial_{\overline{\jmath}} \widetilde{\overline{e}}_a^{\overline{k}})\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{j}} \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

[6] The action (2.4) and supersymmetry transformations agree with those of Baptista [3], upon analytical continuation to a Minkowski worldsheet following the Appendix in *loc. cit.*, symmetrization of the fermion kinetic terms using (2.11), an overall sign flip, rescaling σ, λ and the supersymmetry transformation parameters by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, rescaling the theta parameter as $(-\frac{1}{2\pi})\theta_{(there)} = \theta_{(here)}$, as well as a rescaling of the moment map, i.e., $2\mu^a_{(there)} = \mu^a_{(here)}$. Our action (2.4) is also given an overall factor of $\frac{1}{2\pi}$.

[7] We may include the term (2.19) without affecting supersymmetry invariance on a closed worldsheet. Note that if r was a constant in $\mathfrak{g}^*$ instead of $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]^0$, this supersymmetry would not hold. This is the reason we needed the condition (2.17).

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta A_+^a &= i\epsilon_+\overline{\lambda}_+^a + i\bar{\epsilon}_+\lambda_+^a \\
\delta A_-^a &= i\epsilon_-\overline{\lambda}_-^a + i\bar{\epsilon}_-\lambda_-^a \\
\delta\sigma^a &= -i\bar{\epsilon}_+\lambda_-^a - i\epsilon_-\overline{\lambda}_+^a \\
\delta\overline{\sigma}^a &= -i\epsilon_+\overline{\lambda}_-^a - i\bar{\epsilon}_-\lambda_+^a \\
\delta\lambda_+^a &= \epsilon_-(\nabla_+^A\overline{\sigma}^a) + \epsilon_+(-F_{01}^a + \frac{1}{2}[\sigma,\overline{\sigma}]^a + iD^a) \\
\delta\overline{\lambda}_+^a &= \bar{\epsilon}_-(\nabla_+^A\sigma^a) + \bar{\epsilon}_+(-F_{01}^a - \frac{1}{2}[\sigma,\overline{\sigma}]^a - iD^a) \\
\delta\lambda_-^a &= \epsilon_+(\nabla_-^A\sigma^a) + \epsilon_-(F_{01}^a - \frac{1}{2}[\sigma,\overline{\sigma}]^a + iD^a) \\
\delta\overline{\lambda}_-^a &= \bar{\epsilon}_+(\nabla_-^A\overline{\sigma}^a) + \bar{\epsilon}_-(F_{01}^a + \frac{1}{2}[\sigma,\overline{\sigma}]^a - iD^a) \\
\delta D^a &= \frac{1}{2}(-\bar{\epsilon}_+(\nabla_-^A\lambda_+^a) - \bar{\epsilon}_-(\nabla_+^A\lambda_-^a) + \epsilon_+(\nabla_-^A\overline{\lambda}_+^a) + \epsilon_-(\nabla_+^A\overline{\lambda}_-^a) \\
&\quad + \epsilon_+[\sigma,\overline{\lambda}_-]^a + \epsilon_-[\overline{\sigma},\overline{\lambda}_+]^a - \bar{\epsilon}_+[\overline{\sigma},\lambda_-]^a - \bar{\epsilon}_-[\sigma,\lambda_+]^a)\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.31}
$$

where $A_\pm = A_0 \pm A_1$, $\partial_\pm = \partial_0 \pm \partial_1$ and

$$
\delta = \epsilon_+Q_- - \epsilon_-Q_+ - \bar{\epsilon}_+\overline{Q}_- + \bar{\epsilon}_-\overline{Q}_+ \tag{2.32}
$$

in terms of the supercharges of the $\mathcal{N}=(2,2)$ supersymmetry algebra. On the other hand, since our theory is defined on $I\times\mathbb{R}$, supersymmetry is not preserved at the boundaries, and we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta S_{matter} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0\Big\{ &-\epsilon_+\Big(\frac{1}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}(\partial_0^A+\partial_1^A)\overline{\phi}^{\overline{\jmath}}\psi_-^i + \frac{1}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}\sigma^a\overline{\widetilde{e}}_a^{\overline{\jmath}}\psi_+^i - \frac{i}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}F^i\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{\jmath}} + \frac{i}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}\Gamma^i_{jl}\psi_+^j\psi_-^l\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{\jmath}}\Big) \\
&+\bar{\epsilon}_+\Big(\frac{1}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}(\partial_0^A+\partial_1^A)\phi^i\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{\jmath}} + \frac{1}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}\overline{\sigma}^a\widetilde{e}_a^i\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{\jmath}} + \frac{i}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}\overline{F}^{\overline{\jmath}}\psi_+^i - \frac{i}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}\Gamma^{\overline{\jmath}}_{\overline{\imath}\overline{l}}\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{\imath}}\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{l}}\psi_+^i\Big) \\
&-\epsilon_-\Big(\frac{1}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}(\partial_0^A-\partial_1^A)\overline{\phi}^{\overline{\jmath}}\psi_+^i + \frac{1}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}\overline{\sigma}^a\overline{\widetilde{e}}_a^{\overline{\jmath}}\psi_-^i + \frac{i}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}F^i\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{\jmath}} - \frac{i}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}\Gamma^i_{jl}\psi_+^j\psi_-^l\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{\jmath}}\Big) \\
&+\bar{\epsilon}_-\Big(\frac{1}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}(\partial_0^A-\partial_1^A)\phi^i\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{\jmath}} + \frac{1}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}\sigma^a\widetilde{e}_a^i\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{\jmath}} - \frac{i}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}\overline{F}^{\overline{\jmath}}\psi_-^i + \frac{i}{2}g_{i\overline{\jmath}}\Gamma^{\overline{\jmath}}_{\overline{\imath}\overline{l}}\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{\imath}}\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{l}}\psi_-^i\Big)\Big\}
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.33}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\delta(S_{gauge}+S_r+S_\theta) = \\
&\frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{1}{2e^2}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0\Big\{\epsilon_+\Big(\frac{i}{2}\overline{\lambda}_{-a}(\nabla_1^A+\nabla_0^A)\sigma^a - \overline{\lambda}_{+a}(\frac{i}{2}F_{01}^a + \frac{1}{4}[\sigma,\overline{\sigma}]^a + \frac{D^a}{2}) + e^2(\phi^*\mu_a + r_a - i\theta_a)\overline{\lambda}_+^a\Big) \\
&\quad+\bar{\epsilon}_+\Big(\frac{i}{2}\lambda_{-a}(\nabla_1^A+\nabla_0^A)\overline{\sigma}^a - \lambda_{+a}(\frac{i}{2}F_{01}^a - \frac{1}{4}[\sigma,\overline{\sigma}]^a - \frac{D^a}{2}) - e^2(\phi^*\mu_a + r_a + i\theta_a)\lambda_+^a\Big) \\
&\quad+\epsilon_-\Big(\frac{i}{2}\overline{\lambda}_{+a}(\nabla_1^A-\nabla_0^A)\overline{\sigma}^a - \overline{\lambda}_{-a}(\frac{i}{2}F_{01}^a + \frac{1}{4}[\sigma,\overline{\sigma}]^a - \frac{D^a}{2}) - e^2(\phi^*\mu_a + r_a + i\theta_a)\overline{\lambda}_-^a\Big) \\
&\quad+\bar{\epsilon}_-\Big(\frac{i}{2}\lambda_{+a}(\nabla_1^A-\nabla_0^A)\sigma^a - \lambda_{-a}(\frac{i}{2}F_{01}^a - \frac{1}{4}[\sigma,\overline{\sigma}]^a + \frac{D^a}{2}) + e^2(\phi^*\mu_a + r_a - i\theta_a)\lambda_-^a\Big)\Big\}
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.34}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta S_B = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0\Big\{&(B_{ij}\partial_0\phi^i + B_{\overline{\imath}j}\partial_0\overline{\phi}^{\overline{\imath}})(\epsilon_+\psi_-^j - \epsilon_-\psi_+^j) + (B_{i\overline{\jmath}}\partial_0\phi^i + B_{\overline{\imath}\overline{\jmath}}\partial_0\overline{\phi}^{\overline{\imath}})(-\bar{\epsilon}_+\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{\jmath}} + \bar{\epsilon}_-\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{\jmath}}) \\
&+\frac{i}{2}(\epsilon_+\overline{\lambda}_+^a + \bar{\epsilon}_+\lambda_+^a + \epsilon_-\overline{\lambda}_-^a + \bar{\epsilon}_-\lambda_-^a)\phi^*C_a\Big\}
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.35}
$$

In deriving the above, we have used various identities from Kähler geometry, as well as the Killing equation in the form

$$g_{j\overline{k}}\nabla_{\overline{l}}\overline{\widetilde{e}_a^k} + g_{k\overline{l}}\nabla_j \widetilde{e}_a^k = 0. \tag{2.36}$$

In order to restore supersymmetry at the boundaries, we need to choose an appropriate set of boundary conditions on the fields, and these conditions must themselves be supersymmetric. In fact, only an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ subset of the four supersymmetries can be preserved at the boundaries, because of the following reasons. Translation symmetry on the worldsheet is broken at the boundary, where the worldsheet momentum is no longer conserved. Since the $\mathcal{N} = (2, 2)$ supersymmetry algebra includes

$$\{Q_\pm, \overline{Q}_\pm\} = H \pm P, \tag{2.37}$$

the previous statement implies that on an open worldsheet, some of the supersymmetries are broken at the boundary. In particular, only certain linear combinations of the original supersymmetries are preserved at the boundary, i.e., those whose algebra do not include the worldsheet momentum. There are two such combinations ([8], Chapter 39)

$$Q_A = \overline{Q}_+ + e^{i\beta}Q_-, \quad Q_A^\dagger = Q_+ + e^{-i\beta}\overline{Q}_-, \tag{2.38}$$

or

$$Q_B = \overline{Q}_+ + e^{i\beta}\overline{Q}_-, \quad Q_B^\dagger = Q_+ + e^{-i\beta}Q_-, \tag{2.39}$$

where β is a real parameter, and these satisfy

$$\{Q, Q^\dagger\} = 2H, \tag{2.40}$$

which is in fact the supersymmetry algebra of supersymmetric quantum mechanics. These combinations are known as A-type and B-type supersymmetry.[8]

Now, note that one can further generalize the action (2.4) by considering *quiver* GNLSMs, i.e., GNLSMs gauged by a direct product $G_1 \times G_2 \times G_3 \ldots$. This corresponds to having several copies of (2.6), each corresponding to one gauge group G_i together with its own coupling constant e_i, as well as coupling the matter in (2.5) to all of these gauge groups. In Sections 4 and 5 of this paper, we shall focus on finding the A-type and B-type supersymmetric boundary conditions for quiver *abelian* GNLSMs on toric manifolds, that is, GNLSMs with gauge group $G = U(1)^N$. These boundary conditions will ensure that (2.33), (2.33) and (2.35) vanish, restoring A-type or B-type supersymmetry at the boundary. Furthermore, we will identify boundary interactions compatible with these conditions. These boundary conditions and boundary interactions shall correspond to equivariant generalizations of D-branes, which we shall refer to as equivariant A-branes and equivariant B-branes.

[8]The supercharges Q_A and Q_B also happen to correspond to the scalar supercharges preserved in the A-twisted and B-twisted topological sigma models, when $\beta = 0$.

Before ending this section, we note that the action $S + S_r$ ((2.4) + (2.19)) and supersymmetry variations (2.33), (2.34) and (2.35) reduce to the familiar formulae given in [11] for GLSMs and NLSMs with boundary, in the appropriate limits. We can recover the $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ NLSM by setting the group G to be trivial. Alternatively, by choosing $X = \mathbb{C}^N$, we find the usual formulae for a $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ GLSM, with the gauge group G being an isometry group of $\mathbb{C}^N$. For example, the $U(1)^N$ model with target space $\mathbb{C}^N$, i.e. an abelian quiver GLSM corresponds to the action $S + S_r$ with the B-field and all Lie algebra commutators vanishing, the moment map

$$\mu_a = -(\sum_i^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}|\phi_i|^2), \tag{2.41}$$

and the Killing vector fields

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{e}_a^i &= i\mathcal{Q}_{ia}\phi_i \\ \widetilde{\overline{e}}_a^{\overline{i}} &= -i\mathcal{Q}_{ia}\overline{\phi}_i \end{aligned} \tag{2.42}$$

where we have chosen the flat metric $g_{i\overline{j}}d\phi^i \otimes d\overline{\phi}^{\overline{j}} = \delta_{ij}d\phi_i \otimes d\overline{\phi}_j$, and where $\mathcal{Q}_{ia}$ are the $U(1)$ charges of ϕ_i with $a = 1, \ldots, N$.

3 GNLSMs from GLSMs and Mirror Symmetry

It is well-known that $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ NLSMs with target spaces being toric manifolds can be obtained in the IR limit of $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ quiver abelian GLSMs [9]. Hori and Vafa [10] made use of this to prove the mirror symmetry of manifolds with non-negative first Chern class in terms of Landau-Ginzburg theories.[9] This proof of mirror symmetry was later applied to worldsheets with boundaries, whereby the Landau-Ginzburg mirrors of B-branes [11] and A-branes [12] were found.

As shown by Baptista [13], it is also possible to obtain quiver abelian GNLSMs on closed worldsheets with toric target spaces by taking a different limit of quiver abelian GLSMs. Furthermore, using the mirror symmetry of Hori and Vafa, it was shown to be possible to find the mirror Landau-Ginzburg theories of these GNLSMs. This then suggests a natural generalization of Baptista's proof to worldsheets with boundaries, in order to find equivariant A-branes and B-branes in abelian GNLSMs, as well as the Landau-Ginzburg mirrors of these equivariant branes. We shall pursue this line of thought in Sections 4 and 5.

Before doing so, let us review Hori and Vafa's proof of mirror symmetry as well as Baptista's generalization of mirror symmetry for GNLSMs. We shall assume a closed worldsheet for now, but we shall point out the steps where presence of boundaries would affect the analysis. In superfield language, the action of a GLSM with gauge group $U(1) \times$

[9]The mirrors of manifolds with negative first Chern class were not considered since the corresponding NLSMs are not well-defined, i.e., they are UV singular [8]. This then implies that such NLSMs do not coincide with the usual GLSM description.

$U(1)\times U(1)\ldots = U(1)^N$ and target space $\mathbb{C}^N$, i.e., a quiver abelian GLSM, is

$$S_{\rm GLSM} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2x\int d^4\theta\,\Big\{\sum_{j=1}^{N}\overline{\Phi}_j\Big(e^{\hat{Q}_j^b\hat{V}_b+\widetilde{Q}_j^c\widetilde{V}_c}\Big)\Phi_j \;-\; \sum_{b=1}^{N-k}\Big(\frac{1}{2\hat{e}_b^2}\overline{\hat{\Sigma}}_b\,\hat{\Sigma}_b\Big)-\sum_{c=1}^{k}\Big(\frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2}\overline{\widetilde{\Sigma}}_c\,\widetilde{\Sigma}_c\Big)\Big\}$$
$$+\;\frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{1}{2}\int d^2x\Big(\int d^2\tilde{\theta}\;(-\hat{t}^b\,\hat{\Sigma}_b-\widetilde{t}^c\,\widetilde{\Sigma}_c)+\text{c.c.}\Big)\;, \tag{3.1}$$

where we have separated the $U(1)$ gauge groups as $U(1)^{(N-k)}\times U(1)^k$, with the indices $b=1,\ldots,N-k$ and $c=1,\ldots,k$; and where $\hat{t}^b=\hat{r}^b-i\hat{\theta}^b$ and $\widetilde{t}^c=\widetilde{r}^c-i\widetilde{\theta}^c$ are the usual combinations of FI parameters and theta angles. According to Hori and Vafa [8, 10] the mirror of this theory is the following Landau-Ginzburg sigma model with twisted chiral superfields Y^i (whose imaginary parts are periodic, with period 2π) and action

$$S_{\rm dual} =\frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2x\int d^4\theta\,\Big\{-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{N}(Y^j+\overline{Y}^j)\log(Y^j+\overline{Y}^j)\;-\;\sum_{b=1}^{N-k}\Big(\frac{1}{2\hat{e}_b^2}\overline{\hat{\Sigma}}_b\,\hat{\Sigma}_b\Big)-\sum_{c=1}^{k}\Big(\frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2}\overline{\widetilde{\Sigma}}_c\,\widetilde{\Sigma}_c\Big)\Big\}$$
$$+\frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{1}{2}\int d^2x\Big\{\int d^2\tilde{\theta}\;\Big(\Big(\hat{Q}_j^bY^j-\hat{t}^b\Big)\hat{\Sigma}_b\;+\;\Big(\widetilde{Q}_j^cY^j-\widetilde{t}^c\Big)\widetilde{\Sigma}_c\;+\;\sum_{j=1}^{N}e^{-Y^j}\Big)\;+\;\text{c.c.}\Big\}. \tag{3.2}$$

It may seem from the logarithm in this action that the real part of Y^j is positive-definite, implying a boundary in the target space where the metric becomes singular. However, quantum effects remove this boundary via the field renormalization $Y_0^j=Y^j+\log(\Lambda_{UV}/\mu)$ ([8], page 467).[10] The corresponding Kähler metric[11] for this renormalized field is

$$ds^2=\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{|dy^i|^2}{2(2\log(\Lambda_{UV}/\mu)+y^i+\overline{y}^i)}\approx\frac{1}{4\log(\Lambda_{UV}/\mu)}\sum_{i=1}^{N}|dy^i|^2 \tag{3.3}$$

(where y^i is the lowest component of Y^i), which becomes flat in the continuum limit $\Lambda_{UV}\to\infty$. Taking into account the periodicity of the imaginary part of Y^i, this implies that the target space for this Landau-Ginzburg sigma model is the algebraic torus $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^N$ [10].

The duality between these actions is shown as follows. The GLSM action (3.1) can be

[10] The field renormalization of Y^i arises due to the presence of the twisted superpotential in the action (3.2), which can be written as

$$\widetilde{W}=\sum_{a}^{N}\Big(\mathcal{Q}_{ia}Y_0^i-t_{a0}\Big)\Sigma_a$$

where Y_{i0} and $t_{a0}=r_{a0}-i\theta_{a0}$ are bare quantities. Taking into account the renormalization of the FI parameter ($r_{a0}=r_a+\sum_i^N\mathcal{Q}_{ia}\log(\Lambda_{UV}/\mu)$) [8] (where Λ_{UV} is the UV cutoff, and μ is a finite energy scale), in order for the superpotential to be finite, we must renormalize the bare fields Y_0^j as $Y_0^j=Y^j+\log(\Lambda_{UV}/\mu)$.

[11] The Kähler metric is given by $g_{i\overline{\jmath}}=-\partial_i\partial_{\overline{\jmath}}K(Y^i,\overline{Y}^i)$, where $K(Y^i,\overline{Y}^i)=-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{N}(Y^j+\overline{Y}^j)\log(Y^j+\overline{Y}^j)$.

obtained by integrating out Y^j from the following action

$$S_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2x \int d^4\theta \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(e^{\hat{Q}_j^b \hat{V}_b + \widetilde{Q}_j^c \widetilde{V}_c + B^j} - \frac{1}{2}(Y^j + \overline{Y}^j)B^j \right) \right.$$
$$\left. - \sum_{b=1}^{N-k} \left(\frac{1}{2\hat{e}_b^2} \overline{\hat{\Sigma}}_b \hat{\Sigma}_b \right) - \sum_{c=1}^{k} \left(\frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2} \overline{\widetilde{\Sigma}}_c \widetilde{\Sigma}_c \right) \right\} + \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{1}{2}\int d^2x \left(\int d^2\tilde{\theta}\ (-\hat{t}^b \hat{\Sigma}_b - \widetilde{t}^c \widetilde{\Sigma}_c) + \text{c.c.} \right) . \tag{3.4}$$

Alternatively, one can integrate out B^j, to obtain (3.2), modulo the term

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} e^{-Y^j} + c.c.. \tag{3.5}$$

This term appears when we take into account quantum effects, and is generated by vortices ([8], page 469). The $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ supersymmetric actions (3.1) and (3.2) are mirror theories, since the former is in terms of chiral superfields and the latter is in terms of twisted chiral superfields. Furthermore, by comparing the different expressions one obtains for B^j when deriving the two mirror theories, it can be shown that

$$Y^j + \overline{Y}^j = 2\overline{\Phi}_j e^{\hat{Q}_j^b \hat{V}_b + \widetilde{Q}_j^c \widetilde{V}_c} \Phi_j, \tag{3.6}$$

which is an explicit relationship between the fields of the mirror theories. It shall be important to keep in mind that mirror symmetry between these theories stems from T-duality on the phase of the charged chiral superfields Φ_i [10].

Note that we have neglected the boundary terms which appear when integrating out Y^j, as well as the boundary terms that come about when deriving (3.2) from (3.4). The above technique of proving mirror symmetry can be generalized to the situation whereby the worldsheet has boundaries, where the fields obey boundary conditions and where additional boundary interactions could occur, and the relationship (3.6) will still hold [11, 12]. We shall see this in Sections 4 and 5, when we use the above technique to find mirrors of abelian equivariant branes.

To obtain a GNLSM from (3.1), we take the limit where $\hat{e}_b \to \infty$. The $\hat{\Sigma}_b$ kinetic terms vanishes, and the remaining fields belonging to $\hat{V}_b$ become auxiliary fields, and are integrated out. The resulting sigma model has $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ as target space, but is still gauged, since the vector superfields $\widetilde{V}_c$ are still present in the action. However, note that in order to obtain a Kähler target space, the FI parameters $\hat{r}_b$ must be within a Kähler cone.[12] Only then would $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ be a Kähler toric manifold, with k complex dimensions. In this way, we obtain the $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ $U(1)^k$-gauged nonlinear sigma model (GNLSM) with Kähler $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ target space.

Taking the same limit $\hat{e}_b \to \infty$ in the dual Landau-Ginzburg sigma model (3.2) makes the $\hat{\Sigma}_b$ kinetic terms vanish. $\hat{\Sigma}_b$ is then an auxiliary superfield, which we can integrate out

[12]The quotient space $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k} \cong \hat{\mu}^{-1}(-r)/U(1)^{N-k}$ is defined in terms of the $U(1)^{N-k}$ moment map ($\hat{\mu}_b = -\sum_j \hat{Q}_{jb}|\phi_j|^2$) and FI parameters ($\hat{r}_b$). For different values of $\hat{r}_b$, $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ corresponds to different Kähler, toric manifolds (related by blow-ups or flops), or it could alternatively be neither Kähler nor toric. $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ can even have smaller dimension than k for some $\hat{r}_b$, including dimension zero.

to impose the constraints

$$\hat{Q}_j^b Y^j - \hat{t}^b = 0. \tag{3.7}$$

These constraints have the solution

$$Y^j = \hat{s}^j + \sum_{c=1}^{k} v_c^j \Theta^c, \tag{3.8}$$

where $\Theta^1, \ldots, \Theta^k$ are new twisted chiral fields, the complex constants $\hat{s}^1, \ldots, \hat{s}^N \in \mathbb{C}$ are any solution of the algebraic relation $\hat{Q}_j^b \hat{s}^j = \hat{t}^b$, and v_c^j are N primitive vectors $v^1, \ldots, v^N \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ that span $\mathbb{Z}^k$ which satisfy[13]

$$\sum_j^N \hat{Q}_j^b \, v^j \;=\; 0. \tag{3.9}$$

By inserting (3.8) into (3.2), we find that the $\hat{e}_b \to \infty$ limit gives the following $U(1)^k$-gauged Landau-Ginzburg sigma model

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{S}_{\text{dual}} \;=\; & \frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2x \int d^4\theta \,\Big[-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{N}(\hat{s}^j + \overline{\hat{s}}^j + \langle v^j, \Theta + \overline{\Theta}\rangle)\log(\hat{s}^j + \overline{\hat{s}}^j + \langle v^j, \Theta + \overline{\Theta}\rangle) - \sum_{c=1}^{k}\Big(\frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2}\overline{\widetilde{\Sigma}}_c\,\widetilde{\Sigma}_c\Big)\Big] \\ & + \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{1}{2}\int d^2x\Big\{\int d^2\tilde{\theta}\,\left(\langle\widetilde{\Sigma}, \widetilde{Q}_j\rangle\Big(\langle v^j, \Theta\rangle + \hat{s}^j\Big) \;-\; \langle\widetilde{\Sigma}, \widetilde{t}\rangle \;+\; \sum_{j=1}^{N} e^{-\langle v^j,\Theta\rangle - \hat{s}^j}\right) + \text{ c.c.}\Big\},\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the canonical inner product on $\mathbb{R}^k$. This gauged Landau-Ginzburg theory has the holomorphic twisted superpotential

$$\widetilde{W}(\Theta, \widetilde{\Sigma}) \;=\; \langle\widetilde{\Sigma}, \widetilde{Q}_j\rangle\Big(\langle v^j, \Theta\rangle + \hat{s}^j\Big) \;-\; \langle\widetilde{\Sigma}, \widetilde{t}\rangle \;+\; \sum_{j=1}^{N} e^{-\langle v^j,\Theta\rangle - \hat{s}^j} \;. \tag{3.11}$$

The parametrization (3.8) implies that the target space of this gauged Landau-Ginzburg sigma model, which is mirror to the GNLSM on the k-complex dimensional toric manifold $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$, is the k-complex dimensional algebraic torus, $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^k$.

It is important to recognize that even though the mirror action (3.10) has $U(1)^k$ gauge symmetry, its matter kinetic terms do not contain the vector superfields $\widetilde{V}^c$, and therefore, the components of the twisted chiral superfields Θ^c are not coupled to those in the vector superfields, except in the superpotential. In other words, the matter fields in the gauged Landau-Ginzburg theory (3.10), including the scalar fields which parametrize the $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^k$ target space, are *neutral* under the $U(1)^k$ gauge symmetry.

The above calculation, due to Baptista [13], is essentially the same as Hori and Vafa's. The only difference in Hori and Vafa's case is that they start with a $U(1)^{N-k}$ GLSM with $\mathbb{C}^N$ target space instead of one with $U(1)^{N-k} \times U(1)^k$ gauge symmetry, and in the $\hat{e}_b \to \infty$ limit, the gauge symmetry completely disappears in both the GLSM and its mirror, leaving

[13] The existence of this set of primitive vectors is a known fact in toric geometry, where these vectors generate the regular fan associated with $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$.

us with an NLSM with target space $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ mirror to a (non-gauged) Landau-Ginzburg sigma model with target space $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^k$ and holomorphic twisted superpotential

$$\widetilde{W} \;=\; \sum_{j=1}^{N} e^{-\langle v^j,\Theta\rangle - \hat{s}^j}. \tag{3.12}$$

Put differently, the Kähler quotient $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ has a $U(1)^k$ isometry which descends from the residual $U(1)^k$ isometry of $\mathbb{C}^N$ ([8], page 362), and this can manifest either as a local or global symmetry in a $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ sigma model. Baptista started with a GLSM fully gauged by the $U(1)^N$ abelian isometry group of $\mathbb{C}^N$, and ended up with a local $U(1)^k$ symmetry when taking $\hat{e}_b \to \infty$, whereas Hori and Vafa started with a GLSM gauged by only $U(1)^{N-k}$, with the remaining $U(1)^k$ isometry forming a global symmetry of the GLSM, which descends to a global symmetry of the NLSM in the $\hat{e}_b \to \infty$ limit.

Baptista's technique of obtaining GNLSMs from GLSMs is an extremely powerful one, as it allows us to obtain multiple GNLSMs from a single GLSM, by choosing which coupling constants we wish to send to infinity. This implies the equivalence of several GNLSMs with different Kähler target manifolds, as well as the equivalence of branes contained in these manifolds. These branes will be the main objective of our study in the following sections. Furthermore, once a particular GNLSM is obtained, even its gauge group can be modified, by demoting some of its $U(1)$ gauge symmetries to global symmetries. These points shall be useful to keep in mind when reading the following sections, where we attempt to study abelian equivariant branes in as much generality as possible. This shall be achieved by using Baptista's technique to obtain GNLSMs on open worldsheets with toric target spaces, while studying both boundary conditions and boundary interactions.

Explicit reduction of GLSMs to GNLSMs in the case with boundaries

We have only discussed the method of obtaining GNLSMs from GLSMs in superfield language thus far. We would now like to understand this reduction method in component form, so that we may eventually find explicit boundary actions and boundary conditions in GNLSMs. The $U(1)^N = U(1)^{N-k}\times U(1)^k$ GLSM action with boundaries is given explicitly as[14]

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{GLSM} =& \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_i^N \int d^2x \Big\{ - D_\mu\overline{\phi}_i D^\mu\phi_i + \frac{i}{2}\overline{\psi}_{-i}(\overleftrightarrow{D_+})\psi_{-i} + \frac{i}{2}\overline{\psi}_{+i}(\overleftrightarrow{D}_-)\psi_{+i} \\
&- (\sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}\sigma_a)(\sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}\overline{\sigma}_a)\overline{\phi}_i\phi_i - \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}(\overline{\sigma}_a\overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{-i} + \sigma_a\overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{+i}) \\
&- \sum_a^N i\mathcal{Q}_{ia}\phi_i(\overline{\lambda}_{-a}\overline{\psi}_{+i} - \overline{\lambda}_{+a}\overline{\psi}_{-i}) - \sum_a^N i\mathcal{Q}_{ia}\overline{\phi}_i(\psi_{-i}\lambda_{+a} - \psi_{+i}\lambda_{-a}) + |F_i|^2\Big\} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_a^N \frac{1}{2e_a^2}\int d^2x \Big\{ (F_{01a})^2 - \partial_\mu\sigma_a\partial^\mu\overline{\sigma}_a + (D_a)^2 + 2e_a^2 D_a(\sum_i^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}\overline{\phi}_i\phi_i - r_a)
\end{aligned}$$

[14]It is important to keep in mind that the superfield action (3.1) is only equal to this action upon integration by parts, which give rise to boundary terms. However, we shall be concerned with this action, (which has the standard kinetic terms), as well as the GNLSMs we can obtain from it, and their mirrors.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{i}{2}\overline{\lambda}_{+a}(\overleftrightarrow{\partial_-})\lambda_{+a}+\frac{i}{2}\overline{\lambda}_{-a}(\overleftrightarrow{\partial_+})\lambda_{-a}+2e_a^2\theta_a F_{01a}\Big\}\\
=&\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_i^N\int d^2x\Big\{-D_\mu\overline{\phi}_i D^\mu\phi_i+\frac{i}{2}\overline{\psi}_{-i}(\overleftrightarrow{D_+})\psi_{-i}+\frac{i}{2}\overline{\psi}_{+i}(\overleftrightarrow{D}_-)\psi_{+i}\\
&-(\sum_b^{N-k}\hat{Q}_{ib}\hat{\sigma}_b+\sum_c^k\widetilde{Q}_{ic}\widetilde{\sigma}_c)(\sum_b^{N-k}\hat{Q}_{ib}\overline{\hat{\sigma}}_b+\sum_c^k\widetilde{Q}_{ic}\overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c)\overline{\phi}_i\phi_i\\
&-\sum_b^{N-k}\hat{Q}_{ib}(\overline{\hat{\sigma}}_b\overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{-i}+\hat{\sigma}_b\overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{+i})-\sum_c^k\widetilde{Q}_{ic}(\overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c\overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{-i}+\widetilde{\sigma}_c\overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{+i})\\
&-\sum_b^{N-k}i\hat{Q}_{ib}\phi_i(\overline{\hat{\lambda}}_{-b}\overline{\psi}_{+i}-\overline{\hat{\lambda}}_{+b}\overline{\psi}_{-i})-\sum_c^k i\widetilde{Q}_{ic}\phi_i(\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{-c}\overline{\psi}_{+i}-\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{+c}\overline{\psi}_{-i})\\
&-\sum_b^{N-k}i\hat{Q}_{ib}\overline{\phi}_i(\psi_{-i}\hat{\lambda}_{+b}-\psi_{+i}\lambda_{-b})-\sum_c^k i\widetilde{Q}_{ic}\overline{\phi}_i(\psi_{-i}\widetilde{\lambda}_{+c}-\psi_{+i}\lambda_{-c})+|F_i|^2\Big\}\\
&+\frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2x\Big\{\sum_b^{N-k}(\hat{D}_b(\sum_i^N\hat{Q}_{ib}\overline{\phi}_i\phi_i-\hat{r}_b)+\hat{\theta}_b\hat{F}_{01b})+\sum_c^k(\widetilde{D}_c(\sum_i^N\widetilde{Q}_{ic}\overline{\phi}_i\phi_i-\widetilde{r}_c)+\sum_c^k\widetilde{\theta}_c\widetilde{F}_{01c})\Big\}\\
&+\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_b^{N-k}\frac{1}{2\hat{e}_b^2}\int d^2x\Big\{(\hat{F}_{01b})^2-\partial_\mu\hat{\sigma}_b\partial^\mu\overline{\hat{\sigma}}_b+(\hat{D}_b)^2+\frac{i}{2}\overline{\hat{\lambda}}_{+b}(\overleftrightarrow{\partial_-})\hat{\lambda}_{+b}+\frac{i}{2}\overline{\hat{\lambda}}_{-b}(\overleftrightarrow{\partial_+})\hat{\lambda}_{-b}\Big\}\\
&+\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_c^k\frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2}\int d^2x\Big\{(\widetilde{F}_{01c})^2-\partial_\mu\widetilde{\sigma}_c\partial^\mu\overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c+(\widetilde{D}_c)^2+\frac{i}{2}\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{+c}(\overleftrightarrow{\partial_-})\widetilde{\lambda}_{+c}+\frac{i}{2}\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{-c}(\overleftrightarrow{\partial_+})\widetilde{\lambda}_{-c}\Big\},
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.13}
$$

where the covariant derivatives are

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_\mu\phi_i&=(\partial_\mu+i\sum_b^{N-k}\hat{Q}_{ib}\hat{A}_b+i\sum_c^k\widetilde{Q}_{ic}\widetilde{A}_c)\phi_i,\\
D_\mu\overline{\phi}_i&=(\partial_\mu-i\sum_b^{N-k}\hat{Q}_{ib}\hat{A}_b-i\sum_c^k\widetilde{Q}_{ic}\widetilde{A}_c)\overline{\phi}_i,\\
D_\mu\psi_{\pm i}&=(\partial_\mu+i\sum_b^{N-k}\hat{Q}_{ib}\hat{A}_b+i\sum_c^k\widetilde{Q}_{ic}\widetilde{A}_c)\psi_{\pm i},\\
D_\mu\overline{\psi}_{\pm i}&=(\partial_\mu-i\sum_b^{N-k}\hat{Q}_{ib}\hat{A}_b-i\sum_c^k\widetilde{Q}_{ic}\widetilde{A}_c)\overline{\psi}_{\pm i}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.14}
$$

In (3.13), we have first written the GLSM it its familiar form, and then split the terms containing vector multiplet components as in (3.1). We shall now take the $\hat{e}_b\to\infty$ limit in (3.13), whereby the vector multiplet kinetic terms as well as the term $(\hat{D}_b)^2$ vanish. This means that all the components of the vector superfields $\hat{V}_b=\{\hat{A}_{\mu b},\hat{\sigma}_b,\hat{\lambda}_b,\hat{D}_b\}$ become auxiliary.

Consequently, the equations of motion of $\hat{A}_{\mu b}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_b$ give the following constraints on

themselves[15]

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_{ib}[i(\overline{\phi}_i D_0\phi_i - \phi_i D_0\overline{\phi}_i) + \overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{-i} + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{+i}] = 0 \\
&\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_{ib}[i(\overline{\phi}_i D_1\phi_i - \phi_i D_1\overline{\phi}_i) - \overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{-i} + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{+i}] = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_i^N [-\hat{Q}_{ib}(\sum_b^{N-k} \hat{Q}_{id}\hat{\sigma}_d + \sum_c^k \widetilde{Q}_{ic}\widetilde{\sigma}_c)\phi_i\overline{\phi}_i - \hat{Q}_{ib}\overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{-i}] = 0 \\
&\sum_i^N [-\hat{Q}_{ib}(\sum_d^{N-k} \hat{Q}_{id}\overline{\hat{\sigma}}_d + \sum_c^k \widetilde{Q}_{ic}\overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c)\phi_i\overline{\phi}_i - \hat{Q}_{ib}\overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{+i}] = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

while integrating out the gauginos ($\hat{\lambda}_b$) gives the constraints

$$\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_{ib}\overline{\phi}_i\psi_{\pm i} = 0, \tag{3.17}$$

and finally, integrating out $\hat{D}_b$ gives

$$\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_{ib}\overline{\phi}_i\phi_i - \hat{r}_b = 0, \tag{3.18}$$

for $b = 1, \ldots, N-k$.[16]

In order to derive the explicit action for the $U(1)^k$-GNLSM with a *Kähler* target space $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$, we need to set the FI parameters $\hat{r}_b$ to be in a particular Kähler cone, before taking the $\hat{e}_b \to \infty$ limit.[17] Next, we need to find parametrizations for the scalar fields ϕ_i which satisfy (3.18), as well as parametrizations for $\psi_\pm$ which satisfy (3.17). Then, $\hat{A}_{\mu b}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_b$ must be integrated out of the action using (3.15) and (3.16). Finally, we need to replace the matter auxiliary field term

$$\sum_i^N |F_i|^2 \tag{3.19}$$

with the matter auxiliary field term of the GNLSM in (2.5).

[15] To be precise, the equation of motion for $\hat{A}_{0b}$ (which is the first equation in (3.15)) will be modified by a boundary term proportional to $\hat{\theta}_b$, unless appropriate boundary conditions and/or boundary terms are used. We shall assume that this is the case for now, and in the following sections we will study boundary actions whereby the $\hat{A}_{0b}$ equation of motion in (3.15) is precise both in the bulk and at the boundaries.

[16] These constraints are consistent with the $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ supersymmetry of the GLSM action.

[17] In fact choosing the FI parameters $\hat{r}_b$ to be in a Kähler cone actually triggers spontaneous symmetry breaking of $U(1)^{N-k}$ via a Higgs mechanism. This can be seen by integrating out the auxiliary fields $\hat{D}_b$. Then, the $U(1)^{N-k}$ vector multiplets and the scalar fields transverse to the Kähler manifold defined by this Kähler cone become massive, with masses given in terms of $\hat{e}_b$. Then, taking the $\hat{e}_b \to \infty$ limit decouples these massive modes and gives us a theory of massless fields, without $U(1)^{N-k}$ symmetry.

This procedure is simplest for the case of $N-k=1$, where (3.15) and (3.16) reduce to

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{A}_0 &= \frac{\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_i[i(\overline{\phi}_i\widetilde{D}_0\phi_i - \phi_i\widetilde{D}_0\overline{\phi}_i) + \overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{-i} + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{+i}]}{2\sum_j^N \hat{Q}_j^2|\phi_j^2|}\\ \hat{A}_1 &= \frac{\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_i[i(\overline{\phi}_i\widetilde{D}_1\phi_i - \phi_i\widetilde{D}_1\overline{\phi}_i) - \overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{-i} + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{+i}]}{2\sum_j \hat{Q}_j^2|\phi_j^2|}\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N[-\hat{Q}_i(\sum_c^k \widetilde{Q}_{ic}\widetilde{\sigma}_c)\phi_i\overline{\phi}_i - \hat{Q}_i\overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{-i}]}{\sum_{j=1}^N \hat{Q}_j^2\phi_j\overline{\phi}_j}\\ \overline{\hat{\sigma}} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N[-\hat{Q}_i(\sum_c^k \widetilde{Q}_{ic}\overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c)\phi_i\overline{\phi}_i - \hat{Q}_i\overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{+i}]}{\sum_{j=1}^N \hat{Q}_j^2\phi_j\overline{\phi}_j},\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{D}_\mu\phi_i &= (\partial_\mu + i\sum_c^k \widetilde{Q}_{ic}\widetilde{A}_{\mu c})\phi_i,\\ \widetilde{D}_\mu\overline{\phi}_i &= (\partial_\mu - i\sum_c^k \widetilde{Q}_{ic}\widetilde{A}_{\mu c})\overline{\phi}_i.\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

A good example is that of $X=\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, which corresponds to the quotient

$$\mathbb{C}^N//U(1) \tag{3.23}$$

with charges $\hat{Q}_i=1$, and the FI parameter $\hat{r}>0$, which is the Kähler cone of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$. Thus, we should begin with the GLSM (3.13) with $N-k=1$, $\hat{Q}_i=1$ and $\hat{r}>0$. In this case, the constraint (3.18) is

$$\sum_i^N \overline{\phi}_i\phi_i = \hat{r}, \tag{3.24}$$

and is solved by

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_i &= \frac{Z^i\sqrt{\hat{r}}e^{it}}{\sqrt{1+\sum_k^{N-1}|Z^k|^2}},\ i=1,\ldots,N-1\\ \phi_N &= \frac{\sqrt{\hat{r}}e^{it}}{\sqrt{1+\sum_k^{N-1}|Z^k|^2}},\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

where

$$Z^i = \frac{\phi_i}{\phi_N} \tag{3.26}$$

correspond to the inhomogeneous coordinates which parametrize a local patch of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$.[18]

[18]Note that in general, the $(U(1)^{N-k}$-invariant) inhomogeneous coordinates which locally parametrize a Kähler toric manifold $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ take the form $Z^c=\prod_j \phi_j^{v_c^j}$, where v_c^j are the corresponding primitive vectors.

Furthermore, the fermionic constraint (3.17) can be solved by

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{i\pm} &= \frac{\psi_\pm^{Z_i}\sqrt{\hat{r}}e^{it}}{(1+\sum_k^{N-1}|Z^k|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} - \frac{Z^i(\sum_l^{N-1}\psi_\pm^{Z^l}\overline{Z}^l)\sqrt{\hat{r}}e^{it}}{(1+\sum_k^{N-1}|Z^k|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}},\ i=1,\ldots,N-1\\ \psi_{N\pm} &= \frac{-\sum_j^{N-1}(\psi_\pm^{Z^j}\overline{Z}^j)\sqrt{\hat{r}}e^{it}}{(1+\sum_k^{N-1}|Z^k|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

where $\psi_\pm^{Z^i}$ correspond to Grassmann-valued vector fields defined on the aforementioned patch of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$.

Using (3.20) and (3.25), we can show that the scalar kinetic term of the GLSM is

$$-\sum_i^N D_\mu\phi_i D^\mu\phi_i = -\frac{\hat{r}(\sum_j^{N-1}\partial_\mu^A Z^j\partial^{A\mu}\overline{Z}^j)}{(1+\sum_i^{N-1}|Z^i|^2)} + \frac{\hat{r}(\sum_j^{N-1}Z^j\partial_\mu^A\overline{Z}^j)(\sum_k^{N-1}\overline{Z}^k\partial^{A\mu}Z^k)}{(1+\sum_i^{N-1}|Z^i|^2)^2}, \tag{3.28}$$

where

$$\partial_\mu^A Z^j = \partial_\mu Z^j + i\sum_c^{N-1}(\widetilde{Q}_{jc}-\widetilde{Q}_{Nc})\widetilde{A}_{\mu c}Z^j,\ \text{(No sum over } j\text{)}. \tag{3.29}$$

On the right hand side of (3.28), we find the scalar kinetic term given in (2.5) for $X = \mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ and $G = U(1)^{N-1}$, with the metric on $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ being the standard Fubini-Study metric.[19] Comparing the covariant derivative (3.29) with the general form given in (2.9), we find that the holomorphic Killing vector fields corresponding to the $U(1)^{N-1}$ isometry on $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ are given by[20]

$$\widetilde{e}_c^j = i(\widetilde{Q}_{jc}-\widetilde{Q}_{Nc})Z^j. \tag{3.30}$$

The term proportional to $\widetilde{D}_c$ in the GLSM is found to contain the moment map for the $U(1)^{N-1}$ isometry of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$,

$$\widetilde{\mu}_c = \frac{-\hat{r}(\sum_i^{N-1}\widetilde{Q}_{ic}|Z^i|^2+\widetilde{Q}_{Nc})}{(1+\sum_k^{N-1}|Z|^2)}, \tag{3.31}$$

via (3.25), and thereby we retrieve the moment map term of (2.6). Similarly, using (3.20) and (3.25), we find that the $\hat{\theta}$ term gives rise to the the B-field and C-field terms of the GNLSM, with

$$B = -\frac{\hat{\theta}}{\hat{r}}\omega, \tag{3.32}$$

(where ω is the Fubini-Study Kähler form) and

$$C_c = -\frac{\hat{\theta}}{\hat{r}}\widetilde{\mu}_c, \tag{3.33}$$

[19] Here, the FI parameter plays the role of the modulus which parametrizes the size of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$.

[20] The fact that the $U(1)^{N-1}$ charges of the inhomogeneous coordinates Z^j are given by $(\widetilde{Q}_{jc}-\widetilde{Q}_{Nc})$ can also be deduced from (3.26). Likewise, for a general Kähler toric manifold $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ with inhomogeneous coordinates $Z^j = \prod_i \phi_i^{v_j^i}$, the $U(1)^k$ charges can be deduced to be $\sum_i^N \widetilde{Q}_{ic}v_j^i$.

as well as the boundary term

$$-\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\frac{\hat{\theta}}{2\hat{r}}\sum_{i}^{N}(\overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{-i}+\overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{+i}), \tag{3.34}$$

where we have maintained its GLSM form for convenience. We shall comment more on this term below.

In a similar manner, we may continue the procedure explained below (3.18) with the help of (3.20), (3.21), (3.25) and (3.27) in order to obtain the complete GNLSM action given in (2.4) for $X=\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ and $G=U(1)^{N-1}$. For conciseness, we shall only write out the resulting action for $N=2$, i.e., the $U(1)$-GNLSM with $\mathbb{C}P^1$ target:

$$\begin{aligned}
S=&\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Sigma}d^2x\Big\{-\hat{r}\frac{\partial^A_\mu Z\partial^{A\mu}\overline{Z}}{(1+|Z|^2)^2}+\frac{i}{2}\hat{r}\frac{\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{Z}}\overleftrightarrow{\nabla}^A_-\psi^Z_+}{(1+|Z|^2)^2}+\frac{i}{2}\hat{r}\frac{\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{Z}}\overleftrightarrow{\nabla}^A_+\psi^Z_-}{(1+|Z|^2)^2}\\
&-\frac{\hat{r}|\widetilde{\sigma}|^2|\widetilde{e}^Z|^2}{(1+|Z|^2)^2}+\frac{i\hat{r}}{(1+|Z|^2)^2}\nabla_Z\widetilde{e}^Z(\widetilde{\sigma}\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{Z}}\psi^Z_+ +\overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{Z}}\psi^Z_-)\\
&+\frac{\hat{r}}{(1+|Z|^2)^2}\Big(\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_+\widetilde{e}^Z\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{Z}}-\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_-\widetilde{e}^Z\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{Z}}-\widetilde{\lambda}_+\widetilde{e}^{\overline{Z}}\psi^Z_- +\widetilde{\lambda}_-\widetilde{e}^{\overline{Z}}\psi^Z_+\Big)\\
&-\frac{2\hat{r}}{(1+|Z|^2)^4}\psi^Z_+\psi^Z_-\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{Z}}\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{Z}}+\frac{1}{(1+|Z|^2)^2}(F^Z+\frac{2\overline{Z}}{(1+|Z|^2)}\psi^Z_+\psi^Z_-)(\overline{F}^{\overline{Z}}+\frac{2Z}{(1+|Z|^2)}\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{Z}}\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{Z}})\Big\}\\
&+\frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}^2}\int_{\Sigma}d^2x\Big\{(\widetilde{F}_{01})^2-\partial_\mu\widetilde{\sigma}\partial^\mu\overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}+(\widetilde{D})^2+\frac{i}{2}\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_+(\overleftrightarrow{\partial}_-)\widetilde{\lambda}_++\frac{i}{2}\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_-(\overleftrightarrow{\partial}_+)\widetilde{\lambda}_--2\widetilde{e}^2(Z^*\widetilde{\mu}+\widetilde{r})\widetilde{D}\Big\}\\
&-\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Sigma}\phi^*B+\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\Big\{\phi^*C_aA^a-\frac{\hat{\theta}}{2\hat{r}}\sum_{i}^{N=2}(\overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{-i}+\overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{+i})\Big\}\\
&+\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Sigma}d^2x(\widetilde{\theta}\widetilde{F}_{01}),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

where the holomorphic Killing vector field is

$$\widetilde{e}^Z=i(\widetilde{Q}_1-\widetilde{Q}_2)Z \tag{3.36}$$

with covariant derivative

$$\nabla_Z\widetilde{e}^Z=i(\widetilde{Q}_1-\widetilde{Q}_2)\Big(\frac{1-|Z|^2}{1+|Z|^2}\Big), \tag{3.37}$$

and the moment map

$$\widetilde{\mu}=\frac{-\hat{r}(\widetilde{Q}_1|Z|^2+\widetilde{Q}_2)}{(1+|Z|^2)}. \tag{3.38}$$

The action we have obtained for the $U(1)^{N-1}$-GNLSM with $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ target space corresponds exactly to the general action (2.4), with the exception of the (spurious) boundary term (3.34). This term takes the form

$$-\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\frac{\hat{\theta}}{2}\frac{\sum_i^N\hat{Q}_i(\overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{-i}+\overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{+i})}{\sum_j^N\hat{Q}_j^2|\phi_j|^2}, \tag{3.39}$$

when we start with GLSMs with arbitrary $\hat{Q}_i$, for which the reduction procedure gives GNLSMs with toric target space $X = \mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$. This boundary term also occurs in the well-known reduction of GLSMs to NLSMs [14], and can be removed in several ways, including the addition of a boundary term to the GLSM we start with [11, 14], or by a judicious choice of boundary conditions on the fermionic fields. In the following sections, we shall explain how this term is removed in the reduction of GLSMs to GNLSMs when investigating the cases of A-type and B-type supersymmetry at the boundary.

Before ending this section, we would like to point out that the classical procedure of obtaining GNLSMs from GLSMs which we have explained above is valid at the quantum level, since the $\hat{e}_b \to \infty$ limit can be taken for the path integral of the GLSM, and functional integration over the auxiliary components of $\hat{V}_b$ is equivalent to imposing their algebraic equations of motion as constraints. However, taking renormalization of the FI parameters into account, it can be shown that we may only obtain quantum GNLSMs for Kähler targets with $c_1(X) \geq 0$. This is because the RG flow at the one-loop level of the bare FI parameters $\hat{r}_{0b}$ (discussed in [8]) is

$$\hat{r}_{0b} = \hat{r}_b(\mu) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{Q}_{ib} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\mathrm{UV}}}{\mu}\right), \tag{3.40}$$

(where Λ_{UV} is an ultraviolet cut-off and μ is a finite energy scale). As shown in [8], for a basis e_b of $H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$, we have $\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_{ib} = c_1(X) \cdot e_b$. Then, for a holomorphic curve $m = \sum_b^{N-k} m_b e_b$ in X (i.e., an element of the Mori cone of X)

$$\sum_b^{N-k} m_b \hat{r}_{0b} = \sum_b^{N-k} m_b \hat{r}_b(\mu) + \sum_b^{N-k} m_b (c_1(X) \cdot e_b) \log\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\mathrm{UV}}}{\mu}\right). \tag{3.41}$$

For the bare FI parameters to be in the Kähler cone of X, the LHS of (3.41) ought to be greater than zero. In the continuum limit ($\Lambda_{\mathrm{UV}} \to \infty$), this is impossible if $c_1(X) \geq 0$ is not satisfied.

4 Equivariant B-branes and their Mirrors

We shall apply the techniques discussed above to find boundary actions and boundary conditions in abelian GNLSMs with toric target spaces, X, as well as their mirror descriptions. These boundary actions and boundary conditions will correspond to branes wrapping submanifolds of X, which we refer to as equivariant branes. We first study the case where B-type supersymmetry is preserved at the boundary of the $I \times \mathbb{R}$ worldsheet, since this leads us to make contact with a result found previously by Kapustin et al. [15, 16], while in the next section, we shall use similar techniques to study equivariant A-branes. After gaining insights from the study of abelian equivariant B-branes, we shall then proceed to analyze equivariant B-branes for nonabelian GNLSMs.

The combination of supercharges which define B-type supersymmetry are given by (2.39). In the following, we shall set $\beta = 0$ for simplicity, though it is straightforward to

study the $\beta \neq 0$ generalization by the same techniques. In other words, we assume that the supercharges conserved at the boundary are

$$Q_B = \overline{Q}_+ + \overline{Q}_-, \quad Q_B^\dagger = Q_+ + Q_-. \tag{4.1}$$

From (2.32), we find that the corresponding relations among the supersymmetry transformation parameters are

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &= \epsilon_+ = -\epsilon_- \\ \overline{\epsilon} &= \overline{\epsilon}_+ = -\overline{\epsilon}_-. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

We shall also make use of superfields when discussing boundary conditions, and to this end, the concept of 'boundaries' in superspace, due to Hori [12] is useful. For the case at hand, the relevant boundary in superspace is known as 'B-boundary', and corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} \theta &= \theta^+ = \theta^- \\ \overline{\theta} &= \overline{\theta}^+ = \overline{\theta}^-. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Let us first review what is known of ordinary B-branes. For $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ NLSMs, the boundary condition needed to preserve B-type supersymmetry at the boundaries maps each boundary to a holomorphically embedded complex submanifold of the target space [11]. In addition, we may include the following boundary action

$$S_{\partial\Sigma} = \int\limits_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left\{ A_M^X \partial_0 X^M - \frac{i}{4} F_{MN}^X (\psi_+^M + \psi_-^M)(\psi_+^N + \psi_-^N) \right\}, \tag{4.4}$$

which is B-type supersymmetric if and only if $F_{jk}^X = F_{\overline{j}\overline{k}}^X = 0$. Here, we have used real coordinates for the Kähler target space X, where A_M^X is the connection of a line ($U(1)$) bundle on the B-brane, and F_{MN}^X its curvature. The conditions $F_{jk}^X = F_{\overline{j}\overline{k}}^X = 0$ indicate that the line bundle is holomorphic [18]. This boundary action in fact corresponds to a supersymmetric Wilson line, and since we have two boundary components, we can have two different Wilson lines along each boundary, corresponding to two different B-branes supporting holomorphic line bundles, each with different connections and curvatures ([11], page 21).

An alternative formulation of B-branes exists [11], where mixed Dirichlet-Neumann boundary conditions are imposed on the target space coordinates, and the boundary action is

$$S_{\partial\Sigma} = \int\limits_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 A_M^X \partial_0 X^M, \tag{4.5}$$

which is an ordinary Wilson line along each boundary component. This formulation leads us to the same spacetime theory as (4.4) [19]. Moreover, B-type supersymmetry is preserved at the boundary if and only if $F_{jk}^X = F_{\overline{j}\overline{k}}^X = 0$, indicating a holomorphic line bundle.

We are interested in the generalizations of (4.4) and (4.5) (and their corresponding boundary conditions) for GNLSMs. One method of obtaining such a generalization would be to replace ordinary worldsheet derivatives by covariant ones, and attempt to maintain

supersymmetry and gauge symmetry by adding additional terms. However, it is known that (4.4) and (4.5) (and their corresponding boundary conditions) can be obtained from GLSM boundary actions [11]. This suggests the more elegant method of obtaining the GNLSM generalizations from GLSM boundary conditions and a GLSM boundary action, using the methods of Section 3. In the following, we shall attempt to generalize the boundary action (4.4) to the case of $U(1)^k$-GNLSMs with Kähler toric target space, before proceeding to do the same for the boundary action (4.5).

B-branes on $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$ from GLSM

Let us first recall how B-type supersymmetric boundary conditions and the boundary action (4.4) for an NLSM with $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$ target space can be obtained from boundary conditions and the boundary action of a $U(1)$-GLSM with $\mathbb{C}^N$ target [11]. We shall focus on obtaining NLSM boundary conditions corresponding to space-filling branes. To this end, we must impose B-type supersymmetric boundary conditions at the GLSM level which include Neumann boundary conditions on the chiral multiplets.[21]

Using the language of superfields, these conditions are [11, 12]

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{D}}_+\Phi_i &= \hat{\mathcal{D}}_-\Phi_i \\ \hat{\Sigma} &= \overline{\hat{\Sigma}} \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

at B-boundary,[22] where $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\pm = e^{-\hat{Q}_i\hat{V}}D_\pm e^{\hat{Q}_i\hat{V}}$; while in components, they are given as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{+i} - \psi_{-i} &= 0 \\ F_i &= 0 \\ \hat{D}_1\phi_i &= 0 \\ \hat{D}_1(\psi_{+i} + \psi_{-i}) &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\sigma}) &= 0 \\ \hat{\lambda}_+ + \hat{\lambda}_- &= 0 \\ \partial_1\mathrm{Re}(\hat{\sigma}) + \hat{F}_{01} &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

where the covariant derivative of the scalar fields is

$$\hat{D}_\mu\phi_i = \partial_\mu\phi_i + i\hat{Q}_i\hat{A}_\mu\phi_i. \tag{4.9}$$

However, the boundary conditions of some of the vector multiplet fields remain to be specified, and therefore we impose [11, 12]

$$\hat{F}_{01} = -\hat{e}^2\hat{\theta}, \tag{4.10}$$

[21] In general, the B-type NLSM also admits boundary conditions which correspond to lower dimensional branes, the only restriction is that such a brane corresponds to a complex submanifold holomorphically embedded in the target space [11, 20]. These boundary conditions are obtainable in the $\hat{e} \to \infty$ limit from GLSM boundary terms which effectively impose Dirichlet boundary conditions on some of the chiral multiplets [12].

[22] A boundary condition imposed on a superfield automatically implies that its components obey a set of boundary conditions which are closed under supersymmetry.

which further implies

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_1(\hat{\lambda}_+ - \hat{\lambda}_-) &= 0\\ \partial_1(\hat{D} + \partial_1 \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\sigma})) &= 0\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

via B-type supersymmetry. These conditions are also invariant under $U(1)$ gauge transformations. We also need to add a boundary term to cancel the B-type supersymmetry variation of the bulk theta term, i.e., the expression

$$\frac{\hat{\theta}}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma d^2x\ \hat{F}_{01} + \frac{\hat{\theta}}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \frac{(\hat{\sigma}+\overline{\hat{\sigma}})}{2} \tag{4.12}$$

is B-type supersymmetry invariant. Having imposed the above boundary conditions and the boundary term in (4.12), the GLSM action is B-type supersymmetric at the boundaries.

In addition, we include the boundary action

$$S_{\partial\Sigma} = \frac{\hat{\theta}}{4\pi\hat{r}}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \sum_i^N \Big(i\hat{D}_0\overline{\phi}_i\,\phi_i - i\overline{\phi}_i\hat{D}_0\phi_i + (\psi_{+i}+\psi_{-i})(\overline{\psi}_{+i}+\overline{\psi}_{-i}) - \hat{Q}_i(\hat{\sigma}+\overline{\hat{\sigma}})|\phi_i|^2\Big), \tag{4.13}$$

which is B-type supersymmetric on its own.[23] Its inclusion is necessary to obtain the boundary action (4.4), which plays the role of elucidating the geometry of the branes.

Now, recall from [11] that the bulk theta term can be converted into a boundary term in some circumstances. In particular, we have

$$\frac{\hat{\theta}}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma d^2x\ \hat{F}_{01} = -\frac{\hat{\theta}}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0\ \hat{A}_0, \tag{4.14}$$

via Stoke's theorem, but this violates gauge invariance. The violation is

$$\frac{\hat{\theta}}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0\ \partial_0\alpha = \frac{\hat{\theta}}{2\pi}\int d\alpha = \frac{\hat{\theta}}{2\pi}2\pi m \tag{4.15}$$

where $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. However, if $\hat{\theta} \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, then (4.15) implies that $\exp(-i\frac{\hat{\theta}}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\hat{A})$ is gauge invariant, and hence, the *path integral* remains gauge invariant. We shall assume that $\hat{\theta} \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ hereon, by setting $\hat{\theta} = 2\pi n$, where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Doing so, we may then write (4.13) and (4.12) as

$$\begin{aligned}S'_{\partial\Sigma} =& \frac{n}{2\hat{r}}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \sum_i^N \Big(i\partial_0\overline{\phi}_i\,\phi_i - i\overline{\phi}_i\partial_0\phi_i\ +\ (\psi_{+i}+\psi_{-i})(\overline{\psi}_{+i}+\overline{\psi}_{-i})\\ &+ 2\hat{A}_0(\hat{Q}_i|\phi_i|^2 - \hat{r}) - (\hat{\sigma}+\overline{\hat{\sigma}})(\hat{Q}_i|\phi_i|^2 - \hat{r})\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Taking the $\hat{e} \to \infty$ (NLSM) limit, the components of the vector multiplet become auxiliary. Integrating $\hat{D}$ out of the bulk action enforces the constraint

$$\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_i|\phi_i|^2 - \hat{r} = 0 \tag{4.17}$$

[23] If we were to discard the expression (4.13), the boundary conditions would ensure the locality of the equations of motions of the worldsheet fields. However, its inclusion renders the equations of motions for ϕ_i, ψ_i, $\hat{A}_\mu$ and $\hat{\sigma}$ nonlocal [11], i.e., they contain boundary terms.

and consequently, the second line of (4.16) vanishes. Integrating out the rest of the vector multiplet gives several more constraints, the one relevant to the boundary action being

$$\sum_{i}^{N} \hat{Q}_i \overline{\phi}_i \psi_{\pm i} = 0. \tag{4.18}$$

Thus, the boundary action (4.16) reduces to

$$S'_{\partial\Sigma} = \frac{n}{2\hat{r}} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \sum_{i}^{N} \Big((i\partial_0 \overline{\phi}_i \, \phi_i - i\overline{\phi}_i \partial_0 \phi_i) \; + \; (\psi_{+i} + \psi_{-i})(\overline{\psi}_{+i} + \overline{\psi}_{-i}) \Big) \tag{4.19}$$

with (4.17) and (4.18) strictly imposed. As explained in [11], the first term in (4.19) is nothing but the hermitian connection

$$A^X_I dX^I = -n \frac{i}{2} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \overline{\phi}_i \overset{\leftrightarrow}{d} \phi_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{Q}_i |\phi_i|^2}. \tag{4.20}$$

of $\mathcal{O}_X(-n)$ on the toric manifold $X = \mathbb{C}//U(1)$, since it transforms under $U(1)$ gauge transformations ($\phi_i \to e^{i\hat{Q}_i \alpha} \phi_i$)as

$$A^X_I dX^I \to A^X_I dX^I - (-n) d\alpha. \tag{4.21}$$

Here, $\mathcal{O}_X(-n)$ is the holomorphic line bundle on X with $\int_X c_1(\mathcal{O}_X(-n)) = -n$.

Using parametrizations for ϕ_i and $\psi_{\pm i}$ which satisfy (4.17) and (4.18), the explicit NLSM boundary action (4.4) is obtained, with $F^X_{jk} = F^X_{\overline{j}\overline{k}} = 0$, together with the compatible boundary conditions. For example, when $X = \mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, we may use the parametrizations (3.25) and (3.27) to satisfy (4.17) and (4.18), and with the help of the constraints which come from integrating out the vector multiplet, the boundary conditions (4.7) become

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_+^{Z^i} - \psi_-^{Z^i} &= 0 \\ F^{Z^i} &= 0 \\ \partial_1 Z^i &= 0 \\ \partial_1 (\psi_+^{Z^i} + \psi_-^{Z^i}) &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

where the purely Neumann boundary conditions on Z^i indicate that the B-brane is a space-filling brane; while the boundary action (4.19) is reexpressed as

$$\begin{aligned} S'_{\partial\Sigma} =& \frac{n}{2\hat{r}} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \Bigg\{ \frac{-i\hat{r} \sum_i^{N-1} (\overline{Z}^i \partial_0 Z^i - Z^i \partial_0 \overline{Z}^i)}{(1 + \sum_k^{N-1} |Z^k|^2)} + 2\hat{r}\partial_0 t + \frac{\hat{r} \sum_i^{N-1} (\psi_+^{Z^i} + \psi_-^{Z^i})(\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{Z}^i} + \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{Z}^i})}{(1 + \sum_k^{N-1} |Z^k|^2)} \\ & - \frac{\hat{r} \sum_i^{N-1} \overline{Z}^i (\psi_+^{Z^i} + \psi_-^{Z^i}) \sum_j^{N-1} Z^j (\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{Z}^j} + \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{Z}^j})}{(1 + \sum_k^{N-1} |Z^k|^2)^2} \Bigg\}, \\ =& \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left\{ A^X_j \partial_0 X^j + A^X_{\overline{j}} \partial_0 \overline{X}^{\overline{j}} + n\partial_0 t - \frac{i}{2} F^X_{j\overline{k}} (\psi_+^j + \psi_-^j)(\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{k}} + \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{k}}) \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

where $X^j = Z^j$, $\psi^j = \psi^{Z^j}$,

$$A_j^X = -n\frac{i}{2}\frac{\overline{Z}^j}{(1+\sum_k^{N-1}|Z^k|^2)}, \quad A_{\overline{j}}^X = n\frac{i}{2}\frac{Z^j}{(1+\sum_k^{N-1}|Z^k|^2)} \tag{4.24}$$

are the components of the connection of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}}(-n)$, while its curvature is

$$F_{j\overline{k}} = n\omega_{j\overline{k}}, \tag{4.25}$$

where $\omega_{j\overline{k}} = ig_{j\overline{k}}$ are the components of the normalized[24] Fubini-Study Kähler form of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$,

$$\omega = i\frac{(\sum_j^{N-1} dZ^j \wedge d\overline{Z}^j)}{(1+\sum_k^{N-1}|Z^k|^2)} - i\frac{(\sum_l^{N-1}\overline{Z}^l dZ^l)\wedge(\sum_j^{N-1} Z^j d\overline{Z}^j)}{(1+\sum_k^{N-1}|Z^k|^2)^2}. \tag{4.26}$$

The expression (4.23) agrees with (4.4) up to the term $n\partial_0 t$. This term merely reflects the fact that the $U(1)$ gauge symmetry is broken at the boundary, and it can be removed via the gauge transformation (4.21), with $\alpha = -t$. Thus, the boundary conditions (4.22) and the boundary action (4.23) indicate that the worldsheet boundaries are mapped to a space-filling B-brane on $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, which supports the holomorphic line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}}(-n)$.

4.1 Equivariant B-branes on $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$ from GLSM

Having recalled how the B-type supersymmetric boundary action and boundary conditions for NLSMs with toric target spaces of the form $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$ are obtained from a GLSM, we shall now proceed to obtain the B-type supersymmetric boundary action and boundary conditions for abelian GNLSMs with the same target spaces.

Firstly, we impose the following B-type supersymmetric boundary conditions, which are invariant under $U(1)^N$ gauge symmetry, and which include Neumann boundary conditions on the chiral multiplets, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_+\Phi_i &= \mathcal{D}_-\Phi_i \\ \Sigma_a &= \overline{\Sigma}_a \end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

at B-boundary, where $\mathcal{D}_\pm = e^{-\sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}V_a} D_\pm e^{\sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}V_a}$, as well as

$$F_{01a} = -{e_a}^2\theta_a. \tag{4.28}$$

In components, these boundary conditions are[25]

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{+i} - \psi_{-i} &= 0 \\ F_i &= 0 \\ D_1\phi_i &= 0 \\ D_1(\psi_{+i} + \psi_{-i}) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

[24] Unlike (4.26), the Fubini-Study metric that appears in the bulk NLSM action contains the FI parameter, $\hat{r}$, which is the size modulus of the Fubini-Study metric; see (3.28) and footnote 19.

[25] If we analytically continue our worldsheet to be Euclidean, then the requirement of B-type supersymmetry of the boundary conditions (4.29) and (4.30) implies an *infinite* number of boundary conditions [23].

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Im}(\sigma_a) &= 0 \\ \lambda_{+a} + \lambda_{-a} &= 0 \\ \partial_1 \mathrm{Re}(\sigma_a) &= {e_a}^2 \theta_a \\ F_{01a} &= -{e_a}^2 \theta_a \\ \partial_1(\lambda_{+a} - \lambda_{-a}) &= 0 \\ \partial_1(D_a + \partial_1 \mathrm{Im}(\sigma_a)) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

It is crucial to note that these boundary conditions are compatible with the constraints (3.20) and (3.21) which are imposed when taking the $\hat{e} \to \infty$ limit to reduce the GLSM to a GNLSM. We also ought to supersymmetrize the bulk theta terms as in (4.12), which gives

$$\frac{\hat{\theta}}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma \hat{F}_{01} d^2x + \frac{\hat{\theta}}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{(\hat{\sigma}+\overline{\hat{\sigma}})}{2} dx^0 + \sum_c^{N-1} \Big(\frac{\widetilde{\theta}_c}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma \widetilde{F}_{01c} d^2x + \frac{\widetilde{\theta}_c}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{(\widetilde{\sigma}_c + \overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c)}{2} dx^0 \Big). \tag{4.31}$$

With the above boundary conditions and boundary terms, the GLSM action is B-type supersymmetric at the boundaries.

In addition, we must generalize the $U(1)$-GLSM boundary action (4.13) to a boundary action for the $U(1)^N$-GLSM given in (3.13), with $N - k = 1$. This is given by

$$S_{\partial\Sigma} = \frac{\hat{\theta}}{4\pi\hat{r}} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \sum_i^N \Big(iD_0\overline{\phi}_i\,\phi_i - i\overline{\phi}_i D_0\phi_i + (\psi_{+i}+\psi_{-i})(\overline{\psi}_{+i}+\overline{\psi}_{-i}) - \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}(\sigma_a + \overline{\sigma}_a)|\phi_i|^2 \Big), \tag{4.32}$$

(where the covariant derivatives of the scalar fields are given by (3.14)) and is B-type supersymmetric on its own.

Next, we set $\hat{\theta} = 2\pi n$, which allows us to write (4.32) and (4.31) in a form which generalizes (4.16), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} S'_{\partial\Sigma} = & \frac{n}{2\hat{r}} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \sum_i^N \Big((i\partial_0\overline{\phi}_i\,\phi_i - i\overline{\phi}_i\partial_0\phi_i) \;+\; (\psi_{+i}+\psi_{-i})(\overline{\psi}_{+i}+\overline{\psi}_{-i}) \\ & + 2\hat{A}_0(\hat{Q}_i|\phi_i|^2 - \hat{r}) - (\hat{\sigma}+\overline{\hat{\sigma}})(\hat{Q}_i|\phi_i|^2 - \hat{r}) \\ & + 2\sum_c^{N-1} \widetilde{A}_{0c}\widetilde{Q}_{ic}|\phi_i|^2 - \sum_c^{N-1}(\widetilde{\sigma}_c + \overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c)\widetilde{Q}_{ic}|\phi_i|^2 \Big) \\ & + \sum_c^{N-1} \Big(\frac{\widetilde{\theta}_c}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma \widetilde{F}_{01c} d^2x + \frac{\widetilde{\theta}_c}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{(\widetilde{\sigma}_c + \overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c)}{2} dx^0 \Big) \end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

As in the NLSM case, taking the $\hat{e} \to \infty$ limit results in the vector multiplet components becoming auxiliary (see Section 3). Integrating $\hat{D}$ out of the bulk action imposes the condition (4.17), and this results in the second line of (4.33) vanishing. Integrating out the

rest of the vector multiplet components imposes (4.18), as well as (3.20) and (3.21) (which are no longer relevant to the boundary action once the second line of (4.33) vanishes).[26]

Next, to find the explicit B-type GNLSM boundary conditions and boundary action, we must find parametrizations which satisfy (4.17) and (4.18). Let us study our usual example of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$. Using the parametrizations (3.25) and (3.27), as well as the constraints (3.20) and (3.21), the boundary conditions become

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_+^{Z^i} - \psi_-^{Z^i} &= 0 \\ F^{Z^i} &= 0 \\ \partial_1^A Z^i &= 0 \\ \phi^* \nabla_1^A (\psi_+^{Z^i} + \psi_-^{Z^i}) &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Im}(\widetilde{\sigma}_c) &= 0 \\ \widetilde{\lambda}_{+c} + \widetilde{\lambda}_{-c} &= 0 \\ \partial_1 \mathrm{Re}(\widetilde{\sigma}_c) &= \widetilde{e}_c^2 \widetilde{\theta}_c \\ \widetilde{F}_{01c} &= -\widetilde{e}_c^2 \widetilde{\theta}_c \\ \partial_1(\widetilde{\lambda}_{+c} - \widetilde{\lambda}_{-c}) &= 0 \\ \partial_1(\widetilde{D}_c + \partial_1 \mathrm{Im}(\widetilde{\sigma}_c)) &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

which are invariant under the $U(1)^{N-1}$ gauge symmetry, and satisfy the B-type supersymmetry transformations obtained from (2.30) and (2.31). Moreover, these boundary conditions result in the vanishing of the expressions (2.33) and (2.34), thus ensuring the preservation of B-type supersymmetry at the boundary. Note that the expression (2.35) does not occur when performing a supersymmetry variation, since the B-field and C-field terms do not appear in the bulk action of the GNLSM, as we have used the bulk $\hat{\theta}$ term of the corresponding GLSM in the construction of our boundary action via (4.14). The spurious boundary term (3.34) also does not occur, for the same reason. In analogy with the NLSM case, the Neumann boundary conditions on Z^i imply that the equivariant B-brane wraps the entire target space, $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, i.e., it is space-filling.

Next, let us find the explicit form of the boundary action. The parametrizations (3.25) and (3.27) give

$$\begin{aligned} S'_{\partial\Sigma} = \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \Big\{ A_j^X \partial_0 X^j + A_{\overline{\jmath}}^X \partial_0 \overline{X}^{\overline{\jmath}} - \sum_c^{N-1} i R_c \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_c + n \partial_0 t - \frac{i}{2} F_{j\overline{k}}^X (\psi_+^j + \psi_-^j)(\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{k}} + \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{k}}) \Big\} \\ + \sum_c^{N-1} \Big(\frac{\widetilde{\theta}_c}{2\pi} \int_\Sigma \widetilde{F}_{01c} d^2x + \frac{\widetilde{\theta}_c}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{(\widetilde{\sigma}_c + \overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c)}{2} dx^0 \Big), \end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

[26] It is important to integrate out $\hat{D}$ *before* integrating out $\hat{A}_0$, otherwise the algebraic equation of motion of $\hat{A}_0$ given in (3.15) will be modified by a boundary term, see footnote 15.

where, as in (4.23), $X^j = Z^j$, $\psi_\pm^j = \psi_\pm^{Z^j}$, and the components of the connection A and curvature F of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}}(-n)$ are given by (4.24) and (4.25), respectively. Besides the supersymmetrized $\widetilde{\theta}$ terms, the only other new term (with respect to (4.23)) is

$$-\sum_c^{N-1} iR_c\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_c, \tag{4.37}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_c = -i\big(\widetilde{A}_{0c} - \frac{(\widetilde{\sigma}_c + \overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c)}{2}\big), \tag{4.38}$$

and

$$R_c = \frac{-n(\sum_i^{N-1}\widetilde{Q}_{ic}|Z^i|^2 + \widetilde{Q}_{Nc})}{(1+\sum_k^{N-1}|Z|^2)}. \tag{4.39}$$

The expression (4.36) is gauge invariant under the unbroken $U(1)^{N-1}$ symmetry.[27] Now, we must remove the $n\partial_0 t$ term as we did in the NLSM case, since t is not a coordinate of the $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ target space, but rather locally parametrizes the Hopf fiber over $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ which gives rise to the sphere S^{N+1} defined by equation (3.24). Futhermore, it is not a field which appears in the bulk theory, and has no supersymmetry transformation, leaving us unable to test the supersymmetry of the boundary action. Thus, we shall gauge away $n\partial_0 t$. However, doing so will break the $U(1)^{N-1}$ symmetry of our GNLSM at the boundary.

The cure to this broken symmetry is via the supersymmetrized $\widetilde{\theta}$ terms, as follows. Setting $\widetilde{\theta}_c = 2\pi n\widetilde{Q}_{Nc}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_c^{N-1}\Big(\frac{\widetilde{\theta}_c}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma \widetilde{F}_{01c}d^2x + \frac{\widetilde{\theta}_c}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\frac{(\widetilde{\sigma}_c+\overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c)}{2}dx^0\Big)\\
&=\sum_c^{N-1}\Big(-n\widetilde{Q}_{Nc}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\widetilde{A}_{0c}dx^0 + n\widetilde{Q}_{Nc}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\frac{(\widetilde{\sigma}_c+\overline{\widetilde{\sigma}_c})}{2}dx^0\Big)\\
&=\sum_c^{N-1}\Big(-in\widetilde{Q}_{Nc}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_c dx^0\Big)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.40}$$

since both n and the charge $\widetilde{Q}_{Nc}$ are integers, as explained below (4.14). Then, the final boundary action takes the form

$$S'_{\partial\Sigma} = \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0\Big\{A_j^X\partial_0 X^j + A_{\overline{j}}^X\partial_0\overline{X^j} - \sum_c^{N-1} i\widetilde{R}_c\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_c - \frac{i}{2}F_{j\overline{k}}^X(\psi_+^j+\psi_-^j)(\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{k}}+\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{k}})\Big\}, \tag{4.41}$$

[27] Note that, from the local parametrizations (3.25) and (3.27), we can see that the $U(1)^{N-1}$ gauge transformation of t is $\delta t = \widetilde{Q}_{Nc}\alpha$, since we know that the $U(1)^{N-1}$ charge of Z^i is $\widetilde{Q}_{1c} - \widetilde{Q}_{Nc}$.

where[28]

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{R}_c &= \frac{-n(\sum_i^{N-1}(\widetilde{Q}_{ic}-\widetilde{Q}_{Nc})|Z^i|^2)}{(1+\sum_k^{N-1}|Z^k|^2)}\\ &= -A_i^X\widetilde{e}_c^i - A_{\overline{j}}^X\overline{\widetilde{e}}_c^{\overline{j}}\\ &= -\iota_{\widetilde{e}_c}A^X.\end{aligned} \tag{4.42}$$

Invariance of the boundary action (4.41) under the B-type supersymmetry transformations (given by (2.30) and (2.31) for $\epsilon_+ = -\epsilon_-$) holds if and only if

$$d\widetilde{R} = \iota_{\widetilde{e}}F^X. \tag{4.43}$$

This is known as the the equivariant Bianchi identity, and implies that the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}}(-n)$ has $U(1)^{N-1}$-*equivariant* structure,[29] for which $\widetilde{R}_c$ is the *moment* [21, 22].[30]

The equivariant Bianchi identity is in fact a restatement of the $U(1)^{N-1}$-invariance of the connection,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}}A^X = 0, \tag{4.44}$$

Now, rewriting the boundary action (4.41) as

$$S'_{\partial\Sigma} = \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0\left\{A_j^X\partial_0^A X^j + A_{\overline{j}}^X\partial_0^A\overline{X}^{\overline{j}} + \sum_c^{N-1}\widetilde{R}_c\frac{(\widetilde{\sigma}_c+\overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c)}{2} - \frac{i}{2}F_{j\overline{k}}^X(\psi_+^j+\psi_-^j)(\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{k}}+\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{k}})\right\} \tag{4.45}$$

facilitates the proof that it is invariant under the gauge transformations given in (2.25) and (2.26) for $G = U(1)^{N-1}$. The variation is

$$\begin{aligned}&\delta S'_{\partial\Sigma}\\ &= \sum_a^{N-1}\alpha_a\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0\left\{\mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}_a}A_j^X\partial_0^A X^j + \mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}_a}A_{\overline{j}}^X\partial_0^A\overline{X}^{\overline{j}} + \sum_c^{N-1}\iota_{\widetilde{e}_a}d\widetilde{R}_c\frac{(\widetilde{\sigma}_c+\overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c)}{2} - \frac{i}{2}\mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}_a}F_{j\overline{k}}^X(\psi_+^j+\psi_-^j)(\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{k}}+\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{k}})\right\},\end{aligned} \tag{4.46}$$

which vanishes using (4.44), as well as the identities $\mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}}F^X = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}}\widetilde{R} = \iota_{\widetilde{e}}d\widetilde{R} = 0$.

It may seem that we have picked a random value for $\widetilde{\theta}_c$ in the derivation above, but this was merely a convenient choice. In fact, we can set $\widetilde{\theta}_c = 2\pi m_c$ for any integer m_c, and still derive a boundary action which is B-type supersymmetry invariant, as well as gauge invariant mod $2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. This freedom is merely a reflection of the fact that the moment in the equivariant Bianchi identity (4.43) is only defined up to a constant.

[28] As in the analogous NLSM case [11], the boundary action (4.41) results in equations of motions which are modified by boundary terms, for some of the fields, c.f. footnote 23.

[29] The G-equivariant Bianchi identity is equivalent to the G-invariance of the connection, A, of the bundle (equation (4.44)), which implies that the covariant derivative $d + A$ is G-invariant, and this defines a G-equivariant bundle, see [22], Section 3.2.

[30] For equivariant bundles with *abelian* connection, the equivariant Bianchi identity takes the same form as the moment map equation (2.16). For the present case of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}}(-n)$, it is in fact proportional; the curvature is $F = n\omega$, which means that $\widetilde{R} = n\widetilde{\mu}$, where $\widetilde{\mu}$ is the normalized moment map of the $U(1)^{N-1}$-isometry of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ (the discrepancy with (3.31) is because the moment map for an abelian G-action is only defined up to the addition of a constant, as explained below equation (2.17)).

We have thus found B-type supersymmetric and $U(1)^{N-1}$ gauge invariant boundary conditions and boundary interactions corresponding to an equivariant B-brane in $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, which is a space-filling brane supporting the holomorphic line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}}(-n)$ with $U(1)^{N-1}$-equivariant structure. We may follow a procedure analogous to that presented above for $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ in order to describe an equivariant B-brane in a toric manifold $X = \mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$ (by choosing different values for $\hat{Q}_i$), which would be a space-filling brane supporting the holomorphic line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(-n)$ with $U(1)^{N-1}$-equivariant structure.

The GNLSM boundary action (4.41) that we have derived from the GLSM expression (4.32) is a special case of the more general boundary Wilson line found by Kapustin et al. [15, 16], using a B-twisted *topological* nonabelian GNLSM, with gauge group G and target space X, i.e., a gauged B-model. When the worldsheet is the Euclidean strip $I \times \mathbb{R}$, this Wilson line takes the form of the path integral insertion

$$W = \mathrm{STr}(P\ (e^{i\mathcal{N}})) \tag{4.47}$$

with

$$\mathcal{N} = \int\limits_{\partial\Sigma} dx^2 \left\{ A^X_j \partial_2 X^j + A^X_{\overline{j}} \partial_2 \overline{X^j} - \sum_c^{\dim \mathfrak{g}} \widetilde{R}_c \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{2c} - \frac{1}{2} F^X_{j\overline{k}} (\psi^j_+ + \psi^j_-)_2 (\overline{\psi}^{\overline{k}}_+ + \overline{\psi}^{\overline{k}}_-)_s + \frac{1}{2} (\psi^j_+ + \psi^j_-)_2 \nabla^E_j T \right\}, \tag{4.48}$$

where x^2 is the direction along the boundaries,

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{2c} = \widetilde{A}_{2c} + i \frac{(\widetilde{\sigma}_c + \overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c)_2}{2}, \tag{4.49}$$

is a complexified gauge field valued in $G_{\mathbb{C}}$, and where quantities with subscript '2' are components of one-forms along the boundary, while the quantity with subscript 's' is a scalar. Here, A is the *superconnection* of a *graded* G-equivariant holomorphic *vector* bundle, E, with the covariant derivative $\nabla^E = d + A$; while T is a holomorphic degree-1 endomorphism $T : E \to E$, which satisfies $T^2 = 0$. The holomorphic transition functions of E are valued in a structure supergroup. Moreover, A, F, $\widetilde{R}$, and T are valued in the Lie superalgebra of this structure supergroup, and obey the equivariant Bianchi identity

$$\nabla^E \widetilde{R} = \iota_{\widetilde{e}} F^X, \tag{4.50}$$

as well as the identity

$$\widetilde{e}^i \nabla^E_i T + [\widetilde{R}, T] = 0. \tag{4.51}$$

The expression (4.48) agrees with our result (4.41) when we take E to be an ungraded holomorphic line bundle with $U(1)$ structure group. To see this, we need to analytically continue the Minkowski strip to Euclidean signature ($x^0 = -ix^2$) and B-twist the fields in (4.41). Then, the expression (4.38) becomes the complexified gauge field (4.49), and the fermionic fields become scalars or one-forms along the boundary. Finally, we note that the $\nabla^E_j T$ term in (4.48) does not occur in (4.41) since an ungraded bundle does not admit a degree-1 endomorphism; hence, $T = 0$.

As explained by Kapustin et al. [15, 16], in some cases, the category of branes defined by (4.48) is equivalent to $D^b_{G_\mathbb{C}}(Coh(X))$, the bounded, derived category of $G_\mathbb{C}$-equivariant coherent sheaves on the target space, X. This occurs if X has a G-resolution property, i.e., any G-equivariant coherent sheaf on X has a G-equivariant resolution by G-equivariant holomorphic vector bundles. This property, however, does not hold for general complex manifolds. Nevertheless, even for such spaces where it does not hold, it is believed that the full category of equivariant B-branes is still $D^b_{G_\mathbb{C}}(Coh(X))$, where the GNLSMs for these spaces require more general boundary actions corresponding to differential graded (DG) modules over Dolbeault DG-algebras of X, instead of holomorphic bundles [15, 16].

In our construction, we have found abelian equivariant B-branes which wrap toric manifolds given by the quotient $X = \mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$, and which support the $U(1)^{N-1}$-equivariant holomorphic line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(-n)$. In the language of algebraic geometry, $\mathcal{O}_X(-n)$ is a locally-free sheaf of rank 1, and is in fact one of the simplest objects of $D^b(Coh(X))$ ([20], page 56). The additional $U(1)^{N-1}$-equivariant structure then implies that the equivariant B-branes we have found are objects in $D^b_{(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{N-1}}(Coh(X))$, the bounded, derived category of $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{N-1}$-equivariant coherent sheaves on X.[31] Of course, we have not constructed all the objects in the category.

In particular, we have not constructed equivariant holomorphic vector bundles of rank greater than 1, nor have we constructed non-space-filling equivariant B-branes. The latter, i.e., equivariant B-branes of lower dimension, should exist, in analogy with the NLSM case (see footnote 21), although we shall not attempt to construct them here. The path to doing so is via Hori's construction of non-space-filling ordinary B-branes from GLSMs [12]. Using the same GLSM used there, but with gauge group generalized to $U(1)^N$, we should be able to derive the relevant GNLSM boundary action and boundary conditions, as we have done for space-filling equivariant B-branes in this section.

4.2 Equivariant B-branes on $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ from GLSM

The prior discussion can be generalized to the case of general Kähler toric manifolds, i.e., $X = \mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$. We impose the B-type supersymmetric boundary conditions (4.27) and (4.28) on the GLSM (for $N-k>1$), which include the purely Neumann boundary conditions on ϕ_i, while also supersymmetrizing the GLSM theta terms

$$\sum_b^{N-k}\Big(\frac{\hat\theta_b}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma \hat F_{01b}d^2x+\frac{\hat\theta_b}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\frac{(\hat\sigma_b+\overline{\hat\sigma}_b)}{2}dx^0\Big)+\sum_c^k\Big(\frac{\widetilde\theta_c}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma \widetilde F_{01c}d^2x+\frac{\widetilde\theta_c}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\frac{(\widetilde\sigma_c+\overline{\widetilde\sigma}_c)}{2}dx^0\Big). \tag{4.52}$$

This preserves B-type supersymmetry at the boundaries. In addition, the B-type supersymmetric GLSM boundary action needed is

$$S_{\partial\Sigma}=\frac{\theta'}{4\pi r'}\int_{\partial\Sigma}dx^0\sum_i^N\Big(iD_0\overline\phi_i\,\phi_i-i\overline\phi_iD_0\phi_i+(\psi_{+i}+\psi_{-i})(\overline\psi_{+i}+\overline\psi_{-i})-\sum_a^N\mathcal{Q}_{ia}(\sigma_a+\overline\sigma_a)|\phi_i|^2\Big), \tag{4.53}$$

[31] The algebraic torus $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{N-1}$ is the complexification of $U(1)^{N-1}$.

where $\theta' = 2\pi n'$ ($n' \in \mathbb{Z}$) and $r' \in \mathbb{R}$. In addition, we ought to set $\hat{\theta}_b = 2\pi\hat{n}_b$, where $\hat{n}_b \in \mathbb{Z}$, and we need to impose the condition

$$\frac{\theta'}{r'} = \frac{\hat{\theta}_b}{\hat{r}_b} \tag{4.54}$$

for all values of b.

This allows us to write (4.53) and (4.52) as

$$\begin{aligned} S'_{\partial\Sigma} =& \frac{n'}{2r'} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \sum_i^N \Big((i\partial_0\overline{\phi}_i\,\phi_i - i\overline{\phi}_i\partial_0\phi_i) \;+\; (\psi_{+i} + \psi_{-i})(\overline{\psi}_{+i} + \overline{\psi}_{-i}) \\ &+ 2\sum_b^{N-k} \hat{A}_{0b}(\hat{Q}_{ib}|\phi_i|^2 - \hat{r}_b) - \sum_b^{N-k} (\hat{\sigma}_b + \overline{\hat{\sigma}}_b)(\hat{Q}_{ib}|\phi_i|^2 - \hat{r}_b) \\ &+ 2\sum_c^k \widetilde{A}_{0c}\widetilde{Q}_{ic}|\phi_i|^2 - \sum_c^k (\widetilde{\sigma}_c + \overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c)\widetilde{Q}_{ic}|\phi_i|^2 \Big) \\ &+ \sum_c^k \Big(\frac{\widetilde{\theta}_c}{2\pi} \int_\Sigma \widetilde{F}_{01c} d^2x + \frac{\widetilde{\theta}_c}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{(\widetilde{\sigma}_c + \overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c)}{2} dx^0 \Big) \end{aligned} \tag{4.55}$$

Taking the $\hat{e}_b \to \infty$ limit allows us to integrate $\hat{D}_b$ out of the action, which imposes the constraints (3.18), and the second line in (4.55) vanishes. Integrating out the other components of the vector multiplets, $\hat{V}_b$, then imposes (3.17) on the entire action, as well (3.15) and (3.16) on the bulk action. Then, to find the explicit boundary action, one needs to use parametrizations which satisfy (3.17) and (3.18). The explicit boundary conditions are also found using these parametrizations, together with (3.15) and (3.16).

We can identify the first term in (4.53) as the Hermitian connection,

$$A_I^X dX^I = -\frac{n'}{r'}\frac{i}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \overline{\phi}_i \overleftrightarrow{d} \phi_i \;, \tag{4.56}$$

of the holomorphic line bundle $\bigotimes_{b=1}^{N-k} \mathcal{O}_X(-\hat{n}_b) = \mathcal{O}_X(\sum_{b=1}^{N-k}(-\hat{n}_b))$ over $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$, since it transforms under $U(1)^{N-k}$ gauge transformations ($\phi_i \to e^{i\sum_{b=1}^{N-k}\hat{Q}_{ib}\alpha_b}\phi_i$) as

$$A_I^X dX^I \to A_I^X dX^I - \sum_{b=1}^{N-k} (-\hat{n}_b) d\alpha_b, \tag{4.57}$$

and setting $\alpha_b = \alpha$, we retrieve the $U(1)$ gauge transformation of the connection of $\bigotimes_{b=1}^{N-k} \mathcal{O}_X(-\hat{n}_b)$. Both supersymmetry invariance and gauge invariance under the residual $U(1)^k$ gauge symmetry of the GNLSM would then require that this line bundle has $U(1)^k$-equivariant structure. Moreover, upon topological B-twisting, we would be able to identify the equivariant B-branes given by this boundary action as objects in $D^b_{(\mathbb{C}^\times)^k}(Coh(X))$, the bounded, derived category of $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^k$-equivariant coherent sheaves on X.

The simplest example would be that of the $U(1)^2$-equivariant holomorphic line bundle $\bigotimes_{b=1}^{2} \mathcal{O}_X(-\hat{n}_b)$ over $X = \mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$, which just corresponds to two copies of the boundary

action given in (4.41), with $N = 2$.[32] One can even consider equivariant B-branes on fibrations of $\mathbb{C}P^1$ over $\mathbb{C}P^1$ known as Hirzebruch surfaces, using GLSMs with appropriately charged scalar fields [8]. It is worth noting that the derived categories of $\mathbb{C}^\times$-equivariant coherent sheaves over $\mathbb{C}P^1$, Hirzebruch surfaces, $\mathbb{C}P^1$ fibered over Hirzebruch surfaces etc. provide a construction of Khovanov homology [24].

4.3 Alternative Formulation

We shall now derive the alternative formulation of abelian equivariant B-branes, in terms of a boundary action which generalizes (4.5), as well as the relevant boundary conditions. Let us first recall the derivation of the NLSM boundary action (4.5) for $X = \mathbb{C}//U(1)$ [11]. The $U(1)$-GLSM boundary action from which (4.5) can be derived is

$$S_{\partial\Sigma} = \frac{\hat{\theta}}{4\pi\hat{r}} \int\limits_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \sum_i^N \Big(i\hat{D}_0\overline{\phi}_i\,\phi_i - i\overline{\phi}_i\hat{D}_0\phi_i \Big). \tag{4.58}$$

To preserve B-type supersymmetry at the boundaries, we must impose [11]

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-i\hat{\gamma}}\hat{\mathcal{D}}_+\Phi_i &= e^{i\hat{\gamma}}\hat{\mathcal{D}}_-\Phi_i \\ e^{i\hat{\gamma}}\hat{\Sigma} &= e^{-i\hat{\gamma}}\overline{\hat{\Sigma}} \end{aligned} \tag{4.59}$$

at B-boundary, where $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\pm = e^{-\hat{Q}_i\hat{V}} D_\pm e^{\hat{Q}_i\hat{V}}$, and where $\hat{\gamma}$ is the phase of $\hat{t} = \hat{r} - i\hat{\theta} = |\hat{t}|e^{i\hat{\gamma}}$. In components, these are

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-i\hat{\gamma}}\psi_{+i} - e^{i\hat{\gamma}}\psi_{-i} &= 0 \\ F_i &= 0 \\ \cos(\hat{\gamma})\hat{D}_1\phi_i - i\sin(\hat{\gamma})\hat{D}_0\phi_i &= 0 \\ \cos(\hat{\gamma})\hat{D}_1(\psi_{+i} + \psi_{-i}) - i\sin(\hat{\gamma})\hat{D}_0(\psi_{+i} + \psi_{-i}) - \cos(\hat{\gamma})(\hat{\lambda}_+ + \hat{\lambda}_-)\phi_i &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.60}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Im}(e^{i\hat{\gamma}}\hat{\sigma}) &= 0 \\ e^{-i\hat{\gamma}}\hat{\lambda}_+ + e^{i\hat{\gamma}}\hat{\lambda}_- &= 0 \\ \partial_1\mathrm{Re}(e^{i\hat{\gamma}}\hat{\sigma}) + \cos(\hat{\gamma})\hat{F}_{01} - \sin(\hat{\gamma})\hat{D} &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.61}$$

which includes the mixed Dirichlet-Neumann boundary condition on the scalar fields ϕ_i. These conditions are not sufficient for B-type supersymmetry of the GLSM action at the boundaries, and in addition, we must impose the boundary condition

$$\frac{\hat{F}_{01}}{\hat{e}^2} = -\hat{\theta} + \hat{\theta}\frac{\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_i|\phi_i|^2}{\hat{r}}, \tag{4.62}$$

as well as integrate $\hat{D}$ out of the action to obtain its algebraic equation of motion

$$\frac{\hat{D}}{\hat{e}^2} = \hat{r} - \sum_i^N \hat{Q}_i|\phi_i|^2, \tag{4.63}$$

[32] In fact, for toric manifolds which are Cartesian products like $X = \mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$, the complete decoupling of the two boundary actions means that we no longer need the constraint (4.54).

which holds on the entire worldsheet.[33] Note that the B-type supersymmetry transformations of (4.62) further implies the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{i}{2\hat{e}^2}\big((\partial_0-\partial_1)\overline{\lambda}_+ + (\partial_0+\partial_1)\overline{\lambda}_-\big) &= \frac{\hat{\theta}}{\hat{r}}\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_i(\psi_{-i}+\psi_{+i})\overline{\phi}_i,\\ \frac{1}{\hat{e}^2}\big(\partial_1(\hat{D}+\partial_1\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\sigma}))+\partial_0(i\hat{F}_{01}-\partial_0\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\sigma}))\big) &= \frac{\hat{\theta}}{\hat{r}}\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_i\big(2iD_0\phi_i\overline{\phi}_i + 2\mathrm{Re}(\hat{\sigma})\hat{Q}_i|\phi_i|^2\\ &\quad -(\psi_{+i}+\psi_{-i})(\overline{\psi}_{+i}+\overline{\psi}_{-i})\big).\end{aligned} \tag{4.64}$$

Unlike the formulation presented earlier, the boundary conditions given above ensure the locality of the equations of motion derived from the (bulk+boundary) action.

Converting the theta term to a boundary term as in (4.14), with $\hat{\theta}=2\pi n$, the complete boundary action is

$$S'_{\partial\Sigma} = \frac{n}{2\hat{r}}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \sum_i^N \Big((i\partial_0\overline{\phi}_i\,\phi_i - i\overline{\phi}_i\partial_0\phi_i) + 2\hat{A}_0(\hat{Q}_i|\phi_i|^2-\hat{r}).\Big) \tag{4.65}$$

The term proportional to $\hat{A}_0$ vanishes in the $\hat{e}\to\infty$ limit, whereby (4.17) is strictly imposed via (4.63), and the remaining term is just the hermitian connection (4.20) of the holomorphic line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(-n)$ on the toric manifold $X=\mathbb{C}//U(1)$, and therefore we obtain (4.5). Integrating out the rest of the vector multiplet components imposes additional constraints which only affect the bulk action but not the boundary action. These constraints, together with the appropriate parametrizations for ϕ_i and ψ_i, are useful for finding the corresponding NLSM boundary conditions.

Now, to derive the boundary action for a GNLSM with $X=\mathbb{C}//U(1)$, we start with the $U(1)^N$-GLSM boundary action

$$S_{\partial\Sigma} = \frac{\hat{\theta}}{4\pi\hat{r}}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \sum_i^N \Big(iD_0\overline{\phi}_i\,\phi_i - i\overline{\phi}_i D_0\phi_i\Big), \tag{4.66}$$

where the covariant derivatives of the scalar fields are given by (3.14). B-type supersymmetry invariance of the $U(1)^N$-GLSM at the boundaries of the worldsheet firstly requires that we impose

$$e^{-i\hat{\gamma}}\mathcal{D}_+\Phi_i = e^{i\hat{\gamma}}\mathcal{D}_-\Phi_i \tag{4.67}$$

$$e^{i\gamma_a}\Sigma_a = e^{-i\gamma_a}\overline{\Sigma}_a \tag{4.68}$$

at B-boundary, where $\mathcal{D}_\pm = e^{-\sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}V_a}D_\pm e^{\sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}V_a}$, while $\hat{\gamma}$ and γ_a are the phases of $\hat{t}=|\hat{t}|e^{i\hat{\gamma}}$ and $t_a=|t_a|e^{i\gamma_a}$ respectively. Secondly , we also ought to impose

$$\frac{\hat{\theta}}{\hat{r}} = \frac{\theta_a}{r_a}, \tag{4.69}$$

[33] The constraints (4.62) and (4.63) result in the third equation of (4.61) becoming $\partial_1\mathrm{Re}(e^{i\hat{\gamma}}\hat{\sigma})=0$.

which in turn implies

$$\hat{\gamma} = \gamma_a, \tag{4.70}$$

since $\gamma_a = \tan^{-1}(\frac{-\theta_a}{r_a})$. Then, in components, (4.67) and (4.68) become

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-i\hat{\gamma}}\psi_{+i} - e^{i\hat{\gamma}}\psi_{-i} &= 0 \\ F_i &= 0 \\ \cos(\hat{\gamma})D_1\phi_i - i\sin(\hat{\gamma})D_0\phi_i &= 0 \\ \cos(\hat{\gamma})D_1(\psi_{+i}+\psi_{-i}) - i\sin(\hat{\gamma})D_0(\psi_{+i}+\psi_{-i}) - \cos(\hat{\gamma})\sum_a^N Q_{ia}(\lambda_{+a}+\lambda_{-a})\phi_i &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.71}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Im}(e^{i\hat{\gamma}}\sigma_a) &= 0 \\ e^{-i\hat{\gamma}}\lambda_{+a} + e^{i\hat{\gamma}}\lambda_{-a} &= 0 \\ \partial_1\mathrm{Re}(e^{i\hat{\gamma}}\sigma_a) + \cos(\hat{\gamma})F_{01a} - \sin(\hat{\gamma})D_a &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.72}$$

which includes the mixed Dirichlet-Neumann boundary condition on the scalar fields ϕ_i. Finally, for complete boundary B-type supersymmetry invariance, we must impose the boundary condition

$$\frac{F_{01a}}{e_a^2} = -\theta_a + \hat{\theta}\frac{\sum_i^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}|\phi_i|^2}{\hat{r}}, \tag{4.73}$$

as well as integrate D_a out of the action to obtain its algebraic equation of motion

$$\frac{D_a}{e_a^2} = r_a - \sum_i^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}|\phi_i|^2, \tag{4.74}$$

which holds on the entire worldsheet.[34] The condition (4.73) further implies two more boundary conditions via B-type supersymmetry. As expected, all the boundary conditions above ensure the locality of the equations of motion derived from the action.

Now, setting $\hat{\theta} = 2\pi n$, the relevant action which consists of (4.66) together with the theta terms is

$$\begin{aligned} S'_{\partial\Sigma} =& \frac{n}{2\hat{r}}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \sum_i^N \Big((i\partial_0\overline{\phi}_i\,\phi_i - i\overline{\phi}_i\partial_0\phi_i) + 2\hat{A}_0(\hat{Q}_i|\phi_i|^2 - \hat{r}) \\ &+ 2\sum_c^{N-1}\widetilde{A}_{0c}\widetilde{Q}_{ic}|\phi_i|^2\Big) + \sum_c^{N-1}\Big(\frac{\widetilde{\theta}_c}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma \widetilde{F}_{01c}d^2x\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{4.75}$$

The term proportional to $\hat{A}_0$ vanishes in the $\hat{e}\to\infty$ limit using the equation of motion for $\hat{D}$ given in (4.74), while the constraints that arise from subsequently integrating out the

[34] The constraints (4.70), (4.73) and (4.74) result in the third equation of (4.72) becoming $\partial_1\mathrm{Re}(e^{i\hat{\gamma}}\sigma_a) = 0$.

rest of the vector multiplet $\hat{V}$ do not affect the boundary action. For $X = \mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, we can use the parametrizations (3.25), and (4.75) becomes

$$S'_{\partial\Sigma} = \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left\{ A_j^X \partial_0 X^j + A_{\overline{j}}^X \partial_0 \overline{X}^{\overline{j}} - \sum_c^{N-1} iR_c \widetilde{A}_c + n\partial_0 t \right\} + \sum_c^{N-1} \left(\frac{\widetilde{\theta}_c}{2\pi} \int_\Sigma \widetilde{F}_{01c} d^2x \right), \tag{4.76}$$

with A_I given in (4.24), and R_c given in (4.39). Then, gauging away the $n\partial_0 t$ term, and setting $\widetilde{\theta}_c = 2\pi n \widetilde{Q}_{Nc}$, we arrive at the boundary action

$$S'_{\partial\Sigma} = \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left\{ A_j^X \partial_0 X^j + A_{\overline{j}}^X \partial_0 \overline{X}^{\overline{j}} - \sum_c^{N-1} i\widetilde{R}_c \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_c \right\}, \tag{4.77}$$

where $\widetilde{R}_c$ is the moment given by (4.42). The boundary action can be rewritten concisely as

$$S'_{\partial\Sigma} = \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left\{ A_j^X \partial_0^A X^j + A_{\overline{j}}^X \partial_0^A \overline{X}^{\overline{j}} \right\}, \tag{4.78}$$

and gauge invariance follows from the identity (4.44), which implies that the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}}(-n)$ supported by the equivariant B-brane has $U(1)^{N-1}$-equivariant structure.

The boundary conditions for the GNLSM with $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ target can similarly be found; for the $U(1)^{N-1}$ vector multiplets, the boundary conditions follow from (4.72) and (4.73), while for the matter fields, the boundary conditions are

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\overline{j}i}(\psi_+^{Z^i} - \psi_-^{Z^i}) + 2\pi F_{\overline{j}i}^X (\psi_+^{Z^i} + \psi_-^{Z^i}) = 0 \\ g_{\overline{j}i}\partial_1^A Z^i - 2\pi F_{\overline{j}i} \partial_0^A Z^i = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.79}$$

and their B-type supersymmetric completions, where g is the Fubini-Study metric and F is the curvature of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}}(-n)$ given in (4.25).

An alternative formulation also exists for $U(1)^k$-GNLSMs with $X = \mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$, i.e., general Kähler toric manifolds. The boundary action for the $U(1)^{N-k} \times U(1)^k$ GLSM is

$$S_{\partial\Sigma} = \frac{\theta'}{4\pi r'} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \sum_i^N \left(iD_0 \overline{\phi}_i \, \phi_i - i\overline{\phi}_i D_0 \phi_i \right), \tag{4.80}$$

where $\theta' = 2\pi n'$ ($n' \in \mathbb{Z}$) and $r' \in \mathbb{R}$, together with the theta terms

$$\sum_b^{N-k} \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}_b}{2\pi} \int_\Sigma \hat{F}_{01b} d^2x \right) + \sum_c^k \left(\frac{\widetilde{\theta}_c}{2\pi} \int_\Sigma \widetilde{F}_{01c} d^2x \right). \tag{4.81}$$

Setting

$$\frac{\theta'}{r'} = \frac{\hat{\theta}_b}{\hat{r}_b} = \frac{\widetilde{\theta}_c}{\widetilde{r}_c}, \tag{4.82}$$

which implies

$$\gamma' = \hat{\gamma}_b = \widetilde{\gamma}_c, \tag{4.83}$$

the relevant boundary conditions are (4.71), (4.72) and (4.73), with $\frac{\hat{\theta}}{\hat{r}}$ replaced by $\frac{\theta'}{r'}$ and $\hat{\gamma}$ replaced by γ'. In addition, the D_a equation of motion is also necessary for complete B-type supersymmetry at the boundary.

By taking the $\hat{e}_b \to \infty$ limit and repeating the familiar procedure, we can obtain the GNLSM boundary action which includes the Hermitian connection of the $U(1)^k$-equivariant holomorphic line bundle $\bigotimes_{b=1}^{N-k} \mathcal{O}_X(-n_b)$ over $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ given by (4.56), as well as the relevant GNLSM boundary conditions.

An important advantage of the alternative formulation of equivariant B-branes over the first one is that because of the constraints (4.69) and (4.82), the form of the GLSM boundary action does not depend on which gauge symmetries we are breaking to obtain the GNLSM. This is necessary for the equivalence of equivariant B-branes in different toric targets of GNLSMs obtained from a single GLSM. In order to ensure that this holds for the first formulation, we can impose the same constraints for it.

4.4 Quantum Corrections

We have heretofore analyzed the boundary conditions of the classical $U(1)^{N-k} \times U(1)^k$ GLSM, and the respective GNLSM limits of these conditions, in two equivalent formulations. We shall now investigate quantum effects for the alternative formulation of equivariant B-branes given in Section 4.3,[35] since we shall use this formulation for the proof of mirror symmetry in the following section.[36]

There are two quantum effects of the $U(1)^{N-k} \times U(1)^k$ GLSM with $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} \neq 0$ which are important [11]. The first of these is the running of the FI parameters

$$r_{0a} = r_a(\mu) + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{UV}}}{\mu}\right), \tag{4.84}$$

where r_{0a} denotes bare parameters, Λ_{UV} is an ultraviolet cut-off, and μ is a finite energy scale. By integrating the beta functions of the FI parameters, $\beta_a = \mu \frac{dr_a}{d\mu}$, the μ-dependence is found to be

$$r_a(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} \log\left(\frac{\mu}{\Lambda}\right), \tag{4.85}$$

where Λ is the renormalization group invariant dynamical scale. The running of r_a implies that the phase, $e^{i\gamma_a} = t_a/|t_a|$, which appears in the boundary conditions we have used, changes with the renormalization group flow. The second quantum effect is the anomaly of the $U(1)$ axial R-symmetry, whereby axial R-rotations $\psi_{\pm i} \to e^{\pm i\beta/2}\psi_{\pm i}$, $\sigma_a \to e^{-i\beta}\sigma_a$ and $\lambda_{\pm a} \to e^{\pm i\beta/2}\lambda_{\pm a}$ no longer leave the action invariant, but result in a shift of the theta angles, i.e.,

$$\theta_a \to \theta_a + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}\beta. \tag{4.86}$$

[35] We shall not study the quantum effects for the first formulation, since the important quantum correction is the running of the FI parameters, and the FI parameters do not enter the boundary conditions in that formalism.

[36] The following is a generalization of the analysis given in Section 6 of [11] to the case of multiple $U(1)$ gauge groups.

Both effects (4.84) and (4.86) should be apparent in a quantum effective description, whereby the lowest components σ_a of the superfields Σ_a are chosen to be slowly varying and to have large expectation values [8, 11]. This imparts large masses to the charged matter fields ϕ_i, which can then be integrated out as long as we are studying the theory at some finite energy scale μ. From a path integral computation [8], the superpotential of the effective action, which corresponds to a Landau-Ginzburg model,[37] is

$$\widetilde{W}_{(eff)} = -\sum_{a=1}^{N}\left[\sum_{i}^{N}\mathcal{Q}_{ia}\Big(\log(\sum_{a'}^{N}\mathcal{Q}_{ia'}\Sigma_{a'})-1\Big)\right]\Sigma_a - \sum_{a=1}^{N}t_a\Sigma_a, \tag{4.87}$$

wherefrom the effective FI-Theta parameter

$$t_{(eff)a} = t_a + \sum_{i}^{N}\mathcal{Q}_{ia}\Big(\log(\sum_{a'}^{N}\mathcal{Q}_{ia'}\Sigma_{a'})\Big), \tag{4.88}$$

is obtained. Now, by performing an ordinary axial R-rotation $\Sigma_a \to e^{-i\beta}\Sigma_a$ in (4.88), we can retrieve the shift (4.86). Moreover, the energy scale is set by the values of Σ_a, and hence, by letting $\mathrm{Re}(\sum_{a'}^{N}\mathcal{Q}_{ia'}\Sigma_{a'}) = \Lambda_{UV}/\mu$, we retrieve (4.84).

The superpotential (4.87) can be written succinctly as

$$\widetilde{W}_{(eff)} = -\sum_{a}^{N}e^{i\gamma_{(eff)a}}\Sigma_a|t_{(eff)a} - \sum_{i}^{N}\mathcal{Q}_{ia}|, \tag{4.89}$$

where $(t_{(eff)a} - \sum_i^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}) = e^{i\gamma_{(eff)a}}|t_{(eff)a} - \sum_i^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}|$. It is known [11] that a D-brane which preserves the B-type supercharge $Q_B = \overline{Q}_+ + \overline{Q}_-$ is the preimage of a straight line in the $\widetilde{W}$-plane. The corresponding equation is given by

$$\mathrm{Im}\Big(e^{i\gamma_{(eff)a}(\sigma)}\sigma_a\Big) = \text{constant}, \tag{4.90}$$

which can be considered to be the quantum correction to the boundary condition (4.68). In general, finding the explicit solution to this straight line equation is not straightforward. However, there is an explicit solution if the theta angles vanish, i.e., $\theta_a = 0$. In this situation, $\sigma_a = |\sigma_a|$ solves the straight line equation (4.90), with zero slope. Performing an axial R-rotation $\sigma_a \to e^{-i\beta}\sigma_a$, it is then possible to obtain the solution $\sigma_a = e^{i\beta}|\sigma_a|$ with the slope β. However, it should be noted that the axial R-rotation shifts the theta angles from $\theta_a = 0$ to $\theta_a = \sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathcal{Q}_{ia}\beta$, due to the aforementioned anomaly.

Hence, we find that there is a family of explicit solutions which include

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma_a = e^{i\beta}|\sigma_a|,\\
&e^{i\beta/2}\lambda_{+a} + e^{-i\beta/2}\lambda_{-a} = 0, \quad \text{at} \quad \partial\Sigma,\\
&e^{-i\beta/2}\overline{\lambda}_{+a} + e^{i\beta/2}\overline{\lambda}_{-a} = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.91}$$

[37] To be precise, the theory involves a gauge field, whose only effect is a vacuum energy $\sum_a^N e_a^2(\mathrm{Im}\, t_{(eff)a})^2/2$ [8].

parametrized by $\beta = \theta_a / \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}$,[38] which preserve the B-type supercharge

$$Q_B = \overline{Q}_+ + e^{i\beta}\overline{Q}_- \tag{4.92}$$

and $Q_B^\dagger$. Other solutions, including those with $\beta \neq \theta_a / \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}$ exist, but in these cases the quantum corrections are non-trivial, and therefore they are difficult to determine, and we shall not consider them.

Now, note that we have $\beta = \theta_a / \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}$ for all $a = 1, \ldots, N$. Using (4.84) and (4.85), we have $r_0 = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{UV}}}{\Lambda}\right)$, which implies

$$\frac{\theta_a}{r_{0a}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}\beta}{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{UV}}}{\Lambda}\right)} = \frac{\beta}{\log\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{UV}}}{\Lambda}\right)}, \tag{4.93}$$

i.e., we find that θ_a / r_{0a} are equal for all values of a.[39] This agrees with the constraints (4.69) and (4.82). In other words, we find that these constraints, which we previously imposed by hand at the classical level, emerge naturally as a result of quantum effects.

4.5 Mirrors of Equivariant B-branes

In this section, we shall use the alternative formulation for equivariant B-branes, given in Section 4.3, to find the Landau-Ginzburg mirrors of equivariant B-branes, following the exposition in Section 3, as well as the results of [11]. We shall assume in the following, as in [11], that

$$b_{1a} = \sum_i^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} > 0. \tag{4.94}$$

In particular, $\hat{b}_{1b} = \sum_i^N \hat{Q}_{ib} > 0$ implies that we are studying the mirrors of GNLSMs with Fano target spaces.

Let us start with the mirrors of equivariant B-branes on Fano manifolds of the form $X = \mathbb{C}^N // U(1)$. We focus on the family of boundary conditions (4.91). The corresponding boundary conditions of the matter fields include

$$\begin{aligned} &\cos(\hat{\gamma}_0)\, D_1\phi_i - i\sin(\hat{\gamma}_0)\, D_0\phi_i = 0, \\ &e^{-i\hat{\gamma}_0 + i\beta/2}\psi_{+i} = e^{i\hat{\gamma}_0 - i\beta/2}\psi_{-i}, \\ &e^{i\hat{\gamma}_0 - i\beta/2}\overline{\psi}_{+i} = e^{-i\hat{\gamma}_0 + i\beta/2}\overline{\psi}_{-i}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.95}$$

where the axial R-rotations on the fermionic fields have been taken into account. These boundary conditions preserve the B-type supercharge $Q_B = \overline{Q}_+ + e^{i\beta}\overline{Q}_-$. Now, in the continuum limit $\Lambda_{\text{UV}} \to \infty$ whereby $\hat{r}_0 = \hat{b}_1 \log(\Lambda_{UV}/\Lambda) \to \infty$, we have $\hat{\gamma}_0 \to 0$. As a result, the mixed Dirichlet-Neumann boundary conditions on ϕ_i reduce to pure Neumann boundary conditions. This implies that as long as we assume (4.94), quantum corrections remove any ambiguity regarding the space-filling nature of the branes which we are studying.

[38] $\sigma_a = e^{i\beta}|\sigma_a|$ implies the boundary condition $\text{Im}(e^{-i\beta}\sigma_a) = 0$.

[39] Naïvely, it may seem that the boundary action (4.66) vanishes in the continuum limit ($\Lambda_{UV} \to \infty$) due to (4.93). However, this is not the case, at least for $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} > 0$, as we shall see in the next section.

With these facts in mind, let us shift our attention to the boundary action

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\partial\Sigma} &= \frac{\hat{\theta}}{4\pi\hat{r}_0}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\Big(iD_0\overline{\phi}_i\,\phi_i - i\overline{\phi}_i D_0\phi_i\Big)\,dx^0 \\ &= \frac{\hat{\theta}}{2\pi\hat{r}_0}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\sum_{i=1}^{N}|\phi_i|^2(\partial_0\varphi_i + \sum_a \mathcal{Q}_{ia}A_{0a})\,dx^0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.96}$$

Now, by integrating over the modes of ϕ_i in the frequency range $\mu \leq |k| \leq \Lambda_{UV}$ in the path integral, $|\phi_i|^2$ is replaced by $\langle|\phi_i|^2\rangle = \log(\Lambda_{UV}/\mu)$. Since $\hat{r}_0/\hat{b}_1 = \log(\Lambda_{UV}/\mu) + \hat{r}/\hat{b}_1$, taking the continuum limit $\Lambda_{UV} \to \infty$ gives us $|\phi|^2 \approx \hat{r}_0/\hat{b}_1$, which implies that

$$S_{\partial\Sigma} = \frac{\hat{\theta}}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\left(\frac{1}{\hat{b}_1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\partial_0\varphi_i \;+\; \hat{A}_0 + \sum_c^{N-1}\frac{\widetilde{b}_{1c}}{\hat{b}_1}\widetilde{A}_{0c}\right)dx^0. \tag{4.97}$$

The relevant portion of the action with regard to the dualization of mirror symmetry is then

$$S_\varphi = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{\hat{r}_0}{\hat{b}_1}|d\varphi_i + \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}A_a|^2 - \frac{i\hat{\theta}}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\Big(\frac{1}{\hat{b}_1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}d\varphi_i \;+\; \hat{A} + \sum_c^{N-1}\frac{\widetilde{b}_{1c}}{\hat{b}_1}\widetilde{A}_c\Big), \tag{4.98}$$

where we have considered Euclidean signature on the worldsheet for simplicity,[40] and where the terms with fermionic fields which are not essential in the present analysis have been ignored. Let us consider [11] another action with one-form fields $\mathcal{B}_i = \mathcal{B}_{i\mu}dx^\mu$ given by

$$S' = \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[\frac{\hat{b}_1}{8\pi\hat{r}_0}\int_\Sigma \mathcal{B}_i\wedge *\mathcal{B}_i + \frac{i}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma \mathcal{B}_i\wedge(d\varphi_i + \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}A_a)\right] - \frac{i\hat{\theta}}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\Big(\frac{1}{\hat{b}_1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}d\varphi_i + \hat{A} + \sum_c^{N-1}\frac{\widetilde{b}_{1c}}{\hat{b}_1}\widetilde{A}_c\Big). \tag{4.99}$$

The one-form fields $\mathcal{B}_i$ have the boundary condition

$$\mathcal{B}_i|_{\partial\Sigma} = 0, \tag{4.100}$$

i.e., their inner products with tangent vectors of the boundary vanish. If we were to first integrate out $\mathcal{B}_i$, the constraint $\mathcal{B}_i = i2(\hat{r}_0/\hat{b}_1)*(d\varphi_i + \sum_a^N Q_{ia}A_a)$ is obtained (whereby the boundary condition (4.100) is consistent with the boundary condition $D_1\phi_i = 0$ obtained in the continuum limit) and the original action (4.98) is obtained. Alternatively, if we were to first integrate out φ_i, the constraint

$$\mathcal{B}_i = d\vartheta_i \tag{4.101}$$

is obtained, where the fields ϑ_i are periodic with period 2π.[41] The boundary conditions (4.100) then imply that ϑ_i are constants at boundary of the worldsheet. The vanishing of

[40] In the following derivation, we use the notation $|A|^2 = A\wedge\star A$.

[41] For details on why ϑ_i ought to be periodic, see ([8], page 250).

all boundary terms proportional to $\int_{\partial\Sigma} d\varphi_i$ when integrating φ_i out of the action (4.99) requires that these constants are

$$\vartheta_i = \hat{\theta}/\hat{b}_1 \quad \text{at} \quad \partial\Sigma, \tag{4.102}$$

for all i, where $\hat{\theta}/\hat{b}_1 = \beta = \theta_a/b_{1a}$. Now, using the constraint (4.101) in (4.99) the mirror action

$$\begin{aligned} S_\vartheta &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[\frac{\hat{b}_1}{4\hat{r}_0} \int_\Sigma |d\vartheta_i|^2 + i \int_\Sigma d\vartheta_i \wedge (\sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} A_a) \right] - \frac{i\hat{\theta}}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\Sigma} (\hat{A} + \sum_c^{N-1} \frac{\widetilde{b}_{1c}}{\hat{b}_1} \widetilde{A}_c) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[\frac{\hat{b}_1}{4\hat{r}_0} \int_\Sigma |d\vartheta_i|^2 - i \int_\Sigma \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} \vartheta_i dA_a \right] \\ &+ \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\Sigma} \Big[\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{Q}_i \vartheta_i - \hat{\theta} \Big) \hat{A} + \sum_c^{N-1} (\sum_{i=1}^{N} \widetilde{Q}_{ic} \vartheta_i - \frac{\widetilde{b}_{1c}}{\hat{b}_1} \hat{\theta}) \widetilde{A}_c \Big], \end{aligned} \tag{4.103}$$

is obtained. Finally, the boundary term in this action vanishes when we use the boundary condition (4.102), and the dualization process ends with only a bulk action.

In particular, the relationship (reviewed in Section 3) between the fields of the mirror theories, i.e.,

$$Y_i + \overline{Y}_i = 2\overline{\Phi}_i e^{\sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} V_a} \Phi_i, \tag{4.104}$$

holds. From (4.104), we can find the following useful relationships between superfield components:

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &= \varrho_i - i\vartheta_i, \begin{cases} \varrho_i = |\phi_i|^2, \\ \partial_\pm \vartheta_i = \pm 2 \Big(-|\phi_i|^2 (\partial_\pm \varphi_i + \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} A_{\pm a}) + \overline{\psi}_{\pm i} \psi_{\pm i} \Big), \end{cases} \\ \chi_{i+} &= 2\overline{\psi}_{+i} \phi_i, \ \chi_{i-} = -2\overline{\psi}_{-i} \phi_i, \\ \overline{\chi}_{+i} &= 2\overline{\phi}_i \psi_{+i}, \ \overline{\chi}_{-i} = -2\overline{\phi}_i \psi_{-i}, \\ E_i &= -2\overline{\psi}_{-i} \psi_{+i} - 2|\phi_i|^2 \sum_a \mathcal{Q}_{ia} \overline{\sigma}_a, \end{aligned} \tag{4.105}$$

where $\partial_\pm = \partial_0 \pm \partial_1$, $Y_i = y_i + \theta^+ \overline{\chi}_{+i} + \overline{\theta}^- \chi_{-i} + \theta^+ \overline{\theta}^- E_i$ and φ_i is the 2π-periodic phase of $\phi_i = |\phi_i| \, e^{i\varphi_i}$. The relationship between the periodic fields ϑ_i and φ_i is in fact evidence that mirror symmetry of the two theories stems from T-duality on the phase of the charged chiral superfields Φ_i, whereby the neutral twisted chiral superfields Y_i are periodic, i.e., $Y_i \equiv Y_i + 2\pi i$ [8].

We also note that the field renormalization of Y_{i0} (reviewed in Section 3) implies the renormalization of the bare fields ϱ_{i0} as $\varrho_{i0} = \varrho_i + \log\big(\frac{\Lambda_{UV}}{\mu}\big)$. Furthermore, since $\hat{r}_0/\hat{b}_1 \approx \log(\Lambda_{UV}/\mu)$ in the continuum limit, the Kähler metric (3.3) of the target space of the mirror Landau-Ginzburg sigma model is given by

$$ds^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{|dy_i|^2}{2(2\hat{r}_0/\hat{b}_1 + y_i + \overline{y}_i)} \approx \frac{\hat{b}_1}{4\hat{r}_0} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |dy_i|^2 = \frac{\hat{b}_1}{4\hat{r}_0} \sum_{i=1}^{N} ((d\varrho_i)^2 + (d\vartheta_i)^2), \tag{4.106}$$

which is the flat cylinder metric on $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^N$.

As in Section 3, taking the $\hat{e} \to \infty$ limit allows us to integrate $\hat{\Sigma}$ out of the action, and imposes the constraint

$$\sum_j^N \hat{Q}_j Y_j - \hat{t} = 0, \tag{4.107}$$

giving us the gauged Landau-Ginzburg theory with holomorphic twisted superpotential

$$\widetilde{W} = \sum_c^{N-1} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^N \widetilde{Q}_{jc} Y_j - \widetilde{t}_c \Big) \widetilde{\Sigma}_c \; + \; \sum_{j=1}^N e^{-Y_j}. \tag{4.108}$$

We recall that the constraint (4.107) fixes the target space of the gauged Landau-Ginzburg theory to be the algebraic torus $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{N-1}$.

The boundary conditions (4.102) imply that e^{-y_i} have a common phase which is fixed. In other words, the boundaries of the worldsheet are mapped by e^{-y_i} to a cycle $\gamma_{\hat{\theta}}$ in $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{N-1}$ which has $N-1$ real dimensions. This cycle is given by

$$(e^{-y_1}, \ldots, e^{-y_N}) = (e^{-\varrho_1 + i\hat{\theta}/b_1}, \ldots, e^{-\varrho_N + i\hat{\theta}/b_1}), \tag{4.109}$$

where ϱ_i are constrained by $\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{Q}_i \varrho_i = \hat{r}$. In the continuum limit, the pure Neumann boundary condition we obtain for ϕ_i from (4.95), implies the Neumann boundary condition

$$\partial_1 \varrho_i = 0 \tag{4.110}$$

for the coordinates ϱ_i tangent to $\gamma_{\hat{\theta}}$. Using (4.105) and (4.95), we may also obtain boundary conditions on the fermionic dual fields, which are

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-i\beta/2} \chi_{+i} + e^{i\beta/2} \chi_{-i} &= 0, \\ e^{i\beta/2} \overline{\chi}_{+i} + e^{-i\beta/2} \overline{\chi}_{-i} &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.111}$$

These boundary conditions correspond to a D-brane wrapped on the cycle $\gamma_{\hat{\theta}}$; the phases $e^{\pm i\beta/2}$ in (4.111) signify an R-rotation.

With respect to the flat cylinder metric (4.106), the cycle $\gamma_{\hat{\theta}}$ is a Lagrangian submanifold of $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{N-1}$. The A-brane wrapping this Lagrangian submanifold is the mirror of the space-filling B-brane supporting the holomorphic line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(-n)$ with $U(1)^{N-1}$-equivariant structure, where X is a Fano toric manifold of the form $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$.

Let us investigate this A-brane further, by studying the image of the cycle $\gamma_{\hat{\theta}}$ in the $\widetilde{W}$-plane. In particular, we would like to find the mirror of the $U(1)^{N-1}$-equivariant structure on the B-brane. The twisted superpotential (4.108) can be rewritten as

$$\widetilde{W} = \widetilde{W}_{equiv} + \widetilde{W}_X, \tag{4.112}$$

where the first and second term of (4.108) correspond respectively to the first and second term of (4.112). The image of $\gamma_{\hat{\theta}}$ in the $\widetilde{W}_X$-plane is

$$\widetilde{W}_X = e^{i\beta} \sum_{i=1}^N |e^{-y_i}|, \tag{4.113}$$

which is the mirror condition found [11] when studying the mirrors of B-branes without equivariant structure. In particular, $\gamma_{\hat{\theta}}$ is a 'wavefront trajectory' emanating from a critical point p_0 of $\widetilde{W}_X$ (a point in the target space which satisfies $\partial_{y_i}\widetilde{W}_X = 0$). This wavefront trajectory corresponds to the totality of all possible soliton solutions (of the non-gauged LG model mirror to the NLSM with target X) starting from p_0, whose image in the $\widetilde{W}_X$-plane is a straight line with slope $\beta = \hat{\theta}/\hat{b}_1$ with respect to real axis. Since we have set $\hat{\theta} = 2\pi n$ earlier, and $\int_X c_1(\mathcal{O}_X(-n)) = -n$, the slope of this straight line depends on the first Chern class of the holomorphic line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(-n)$ supported by the mirror B-brane [11].

Shifting our focus to the image of $\gamma_{\hat{\theta}}$ in $\widetilde{W}_{equiv}$, we find that it contains the factor

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} \widetilde{Q}_j^c y_j = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \widetilde{Q}_j^c \varrho_j - i \sum_{j=1}^{N} \widetilde{Q}_j^c \frac{\hat{\theta}}{\hat{b}_1}, \tag{4.114}$$

where the first term on the right hand side is a map

$$Eq : \gamma_{\hat{\theta}} \to \mathfrak{u}(1)^{N-1}, \tag{4.115}$$

where $\mathfrak{u}(1)^{N-1}$ is the Lie algebra of $U(1)^{N-1}$. Thus, the map Eq from the cycle $\gamma_{\hat{\theta}}$ (on which an A-brane is wrapped) to $\mathfrak{u}(1)^{N-1}$ is the mirror of $U(1)^{N-1}$-equivariant structure on the B-brane.

The mirrors of equivariant B-branes on Fano toric manifolds of the form $X = \mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ can similarly be found using the above method. These mirror A-branes correspond to Lagrangian submanifolds $(\gamma_{\theta'})$ of the cylinder $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^k$ which is defined by

$$\sum_{j}^{N} \hat{Q}_{jb} Y_j - \hat{t}_b = 0, \tag{4.116}$$

with the additional data of the superpotential

$$\widetilde{W} = \sum_{c}^{k} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \widetilde{Q}_{jc} Y_j - \widetilde{t}_c \Big) \widetilde{\Sigma}_c \; + \; \sum_{j=1}^{N} e^{-Y_j}. \tag{4.117}$$

The first term on the right hand side of (4.117), when restricted to its boundary value, contains the mirror data of equivariant structure on $\bigotimes_{b=1}^{N-k} \mathcal{O}_X(-n_b)$ (which is supported by the space-filling B-brane), which is a map

$$Eq : \gamma_{\theta'} \to \mathfrak{u}(1)^k. \tag{4.118}$$

4.6 Nonabelian Equivariant B-branes

In this subsection, we shall use the insights obtained from studying abelian equivariant B-branes to infer the description of nonabelian equivariant B-branes. In other words, we shall find the B-type boundary conditions necessary for the nonabelian GNLSM studied in Section 2 to be supersymmetric at the boundaries, and state the admissible boundary interactions. This will be achieved by generalizing the first formulation studied in this section for abelian gauge groups (c.f. Sections 4.1-4.3) to nonabelian gauge groups. Note

that the GNLSM notation of Section 2 is used in this subsection. For simplicity, we shall only consider the case where the B-field, C-field and θ-parameter of the GNLSM given in (2.7) and (2.8) are zero (which holds for the example of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ studied in Section 4.1). The equivariant B-brane shall be a submanifold (denoted as γ) of X, to which a boundary of the worldsheet is mapped via $(\phi^i, \overline{\phi}^{\overline{\imath}})$.

Firstly, we note that the terms in $\delta(S_{gauge} + S_r + S_\theta)$ (2.34) vanish using the gauge invariant boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} A_{1a} &= 0, \\ \partial_1 A_{0a} &= 0, \\ \lambda_{+a} + \lambda_{-a} &= 0, \\ \partial_1(\lambda_{-a} - \lambda_{+a}) &= 0, \\ \partial_1 \mathrm{Re}(\sigma_a) &= 0, \\ \mathrm{Im}(\sigma_a) &= 0, \\ \partial_1(D_a + \partial_1 \mathrm{Im}(\sigma_a)) &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.119}$$

These conditions are a direct generalization of the conditions given in (4.35) for the example of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, except that the boundary condition for F_{01a} is replaced by the stricter conditions $A_{1a} = 0$ and $\partial_1 A_{0a} = 0$, and the boundary condition for $\mathrm{Re}(\sigma_a)$ becomes $\partial_1 \mathrm{Re}(\sigma_a) = 0$. The stricter boundary conditions on the gauge fields are necessary since the field strength F_{01a} now contains a nonabelian term, which causes B-type supersymmetry invariance of the set of boundary conditions to not hold unless we use the stricter conditions. The boundary conditions on the gauge fields in fact imply that gauge transformations have to be restricted such that the transformation parameter α^a has vanishing derivative with respect to x^1 at the boundary. The boundary conditions given in (4.119) also preserve the locality of the relevant equations of motion, as long as no additional boundary action is added.

Next, we turn to the boundary conditions for the matter fields. Let us first consider the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ subalgebra of B-type supersymmetry, which corresponds to $\epsilon_+ = i\epsilon$, $\overline{\epsilon}_+ = -i\epsilon$, $\epsilon_- = -i\epsilon$ and $\overline{\epsilon}_- = i\epsilon$. In this case, after integrating out the auxiliary fields F^i and $\overline{F}^{\overline{\imath}}$, we find that (2.33) is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S_{matter} = -\frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{i\epsilon}{2}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \{ & g_{IJ}\partial_0^A \phi^I(\psi_-^J - \psi_+^J) + g_{IJ}\partial_1^A \phi^I(\psi_-^J + \psi_+^J) \\ & + g_{IJ}(\psi_+^I - \psi_-^I)\mathrm{Re}(\sigma^a)\widetilde{e}_a^J + \omega_{IJ}(\psi_+^I + \psi_-^I)\mathrm{Im}(\sigma^a)\widetilde{e}_a^J \}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.120}$$

where $g_{IJ}X^I Y^J = g_{i\overline{j}}(X^i Y^{\overline{j}} + Y^i X^{\overline{j}})$ and $\omega_{IJ}X^I Y^J = i g_{i\overline{j}}(X^i Y^{\overline{j}} - Y^i X^{\overline{j}})$ are respectively the metric and Kähler form on X. Now, any allowed variation of ϕ (denoted $\delta\phi^I$ for the real coordinate ϕ^I) along the boundary, and the covariant derivative along the boundary, $\partial_0^A \phi^I$, ought to be tangent to γ. If we insist on locality of the matter equations of motion, we require that

$$\begin{aligned} g_{IJ}\delta\phi^I \partial_1^A \phi^J &= 0 \\ g_{IJ}(\psi_-^I \delta\psi_-^J - \psi_+^I \delta\psi_+^J) &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.121}$$

at the boundaries. The first constraint of (4.121) then implies that $\partial_1^A \phi^J$ is normal to γ. Hence, taking into account $\mathrm{Im}(\sigma_a) = 0$ at the boundary, we find that (4.120) vanishes if and only if $i\epsilon(\psi_-^I - \psi_+^I)$ and $i\epsilon(\psi_-^I + \psi_+^I)$ are respectively normal and tangent to γ, and $\widetilde{e}_a^I$ is tangent to γ, which implies that γ is G-invariant. In addition, we note that $i\epsilon(\psi_-^I - \psi_+^I)$ being normal to γ implies that $\psi_-^I - \psi_+^I = 0$ along γ and along the worldsheet boundary, which satisfies the second constraint of (4.121).

Next, under B-type supersymmetry, ϕ^i transforms as

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\phi^i =& \epsilon_+(\psi_-^i + \psi_+^i)\\ =& \epsilon_1(\psi_-^i + \psi_+^i) + i\epsilon_2(\psi_-^i + \psi_+^i),\end{aligned} \tag{4.122}$$

where $\epsilon_+ = \epsilon_1 + i\epsilon_2$. Hence, $\epsilon(\psi_-^i + \psi_+^i)$ and $i\epsilon(\psi_-^i + \psi_+^i)$ are holomorphic components of vectors which are tangent to γ, where ϵ is a real parameter. This implies that the tangent space of γ is preserved by multiplication by i on holomorphic components of vectors. Therefore, γ is a holomorphically embedded complex submanifold of X. This complex submanifold also happens to be G-invariant, which we know from the previous paragraph.

Indeed, (2.33) vanishes under this boundary condition. Integrating out the auxiliary fields F^i and $\overline{F}^{\overline{i}}$, (2.33) can be rewritten (for $\epsilon_+ = -\epsilon_-$) as

$$\begin{aligned}\delta S_{matter} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{1}{4}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \Big\{\epsilon\Big(& - g(\partial_0^A\phi, \psi_- - \psi_+) - i\omega(\partial_0^A\phi, \psi_- - \psi_+)\\ & - g(\partial_1^A\phi, \psi_- + \psi_+) - i\omega(\partial_1^A\phi, \psi_- + \psi_+)\\ & - \mathrm{Re}(\sigma^a) g(\widetilde{e}_a, \psi_+ - \psi_-) - i\mathrm{Re}(\sigma^a)\omega(\widetilde{e}_a, \psi_+ - \psi_-)\\ & - i\mathrm{Im}(\sigma^a) g(\widetilde{e}_a, \psi_+ + \psi_-) + \mathrm{Im}(\sigma^a)\omega(\widetilde{e}_a, \psi_+ + \psi_-)\Big) + c.c.\Big\},\end{aligned} \tag{4.123}$$

(where $g(X,Y) = g_{IJ}X^I Y^J$ and $\omega(X,Y) = \omega_{IJ}X^I Y^J$), which vanishes using $\mathrm{Im}(\sigma_a) = 0$ and the facts that $\partial_0^A\phi^I$, $\psi_-^I + \psi_+^I$ and $\widetilde{e}_a^I$ are tangent to γ while $\partial_1^A\phi^I$ are $\psi_-^I - \psi_+^I$ are normal to γ.[42]

As in the abelian case, we may add the B-type supersymmetric boundary action

$$\begin{aligned}S'_{\partial\Sigma} &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left\{ A_j^X \partial_0^A \phi^j + A_{\overline{j}}^X \partial_0^A \overline{\phi}^{\overline{j}} + R_a \frac{(\sigma^a + \overline{\sigma}^a)}{2} - \frac{i}{2} F_{j\overline{k}}(\psi_+^j + \psi_-^j)(\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{k}} + \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{k}}) \right\}\\ &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left\{ A_j^X \partial_0 \phi^j + A_{\overline{j}}^X \partial_0 \overline{\phi}^{\overline{j}} - iR_a \mathcal{A}^a - \frac{i}{2} F_{j\overline{k}}(\psi_+^j + \psi_-^j)(\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{k}} + \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{k}}) \right\},\end{aligned} \tag{4.124}$$

where $\mathcal{A}_a = -i\big(A_{0a} - \frac{(\sigma_c + \overline{\sigma}_a)}{2}\big)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}R_a &= -A_i^X \widetilde{e}_a^i - A_{\overline{j}}^X \overline{\widetilde{e}}_a^{\overline{j}}\\ &= -\iota_{\widetilde{e}_a} A^X\end{aligned} \tag{4.125}$$

[42] Recall that for a tangent vector, T, and normal vector, N, of a holomorphically embedded complex submanifold, γ, of the Kähler manifold X, we have $\omega(T,N) = g(JT,N) = 0$ on γ.

is the moment of a G-equivariant holomorphic line bundle. B-type supersymmetry invariance and gauge invariance of this action follows from the equivariant Bianchi identity

$$d\widetilde{R} = \iota_{\widetilde{e}} F^X, \tag{4.126}$$

and this implies that γ supports a G-equivariant holomorphic line bundle (c.f. footnote 29). One may generalize this even further, as shown by Kapustin et al. [15] (c.f. Section 4.1), by instead including a Wilson line which represents a G-equivariant graded holomorphic vector bundle. As in the abelian case, the inclusion of these boundary actions result in some of the equations of motion being modified by boundary terms (c.f. footnote 28).

In conclusion, we find that in general, equivariant B-branes ought to be G-invariant holomorphically embedded complex submanifolds of X, which support G-equivariant holomorphic vector bundles (which may be graded). As discussed in Section 4.1, at least in some cases, this implies that they are objects in the bounded, derived category of $G_{\mathbb{C}}$-equivariant coherent sheaves on X.

5 Equivariant A-branes and their Mirrors

In this section, we study the A-type supersymmetric boundary actions and boundary conditions in abelian GNLSMs on $I \times \mathbb{R}$ with toric target spaces, X, as well as their mirror descriptions. These boundary actions and boundary conditions correspond to equivariant A-branes wrapping submanifolds of X. Then, with the insights we find from analyzing these abelian equivariant A-branes, we shall proceed to study equivariant A-branes for nonabelian GNLSMs.

A-type supersymmetry is defined by the combination of supercharges given by (2.38). In what follows, we shall set $\beta = 0$ for simplicity, though it is straightforward to study the $\beta \neq 0$ generalization using the same techniques. In other words, we assume that the supercharges conserved at the boundary are

$$Q_A = \overline{Q}_+ + Q_-, \quad Q_A^\dagger = Q_+ + \overline{Q}_-. \tag{5.1}$$

From (2.32), it can be seen that the corresponding relations among the supersymmetry transformation parameters are

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &= \epsilon_+ = \overline{\epsilon}_- \\ \overline{\epsilon} &= \overline{\epsilon}_+ = \epsilon_- \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

We shall also make use of superfields when discussing boundary conditions and boundary actions, and to this end, we shall make use of the concept of 'boundaries' in superspace, due to Hori [12]. For A-type supersymmetry, the relevant boundary in superspace is known as 'A-boundary', and corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} \theta &= \theta^+ = -\overline{\theta}^- \\ \overline{\theta} &= \overline{\theta}^+ = -\theta^- \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Let us first review what is known of ordinary A-branes. For $\mathcal{N} = (2,2)$ NLSMs, the boundary condition needed to preserve A-type supersymmetry at the boundaries maps each boundary to a middle-dimensional Lagrangian submanifold of the target space [11]. With target space coordinates (X^M) chosen appropriately, this is expressed as Dirichlet boundary conditions on half of the fields X^M with Neumann boundary conditions for the rest. In addition, we may include the following boundary action

$$S_{\partial\Sigma} = \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 A^X_M \partial_0 X^M \tag{5.4}$$

which is A-type supersymmetric if and only if $F^X = dA^X = 0$. Here, we have used real coordinates for the Kähler target space X, with A^X_M the connection of a $U(1)$ bundle on the A-brane. The condition $F^X = 0$ on the curvature of the $U(1)$ bundle indicates that it is flat. This boundary action is a Wilson line, and since we have two boundary components, we can have two different Wilson lines along each boundary, corresponding to two different A-branes supporting flat $U(1)$ bundles, each with different connections [11].

We are interested in the generalizations of Lagrangian boundary conditions and the boundary action (5.4) for GNLSMs. A possible method of obtaining such a generalization would be to replace ordinary worldsheet derivatives by covariant ones, and attempt to maintain supersymmetry and gauge symmetry by adding additional terms, if necessary. However, it is known that the boundary conditions and the boundary action (5.4) can be obtained from a GLSM boundary action [12]. We are then led to attempt the more elegant method of obtaining the GNLSM boundary conditions and boundary action from a GLSM boundary action, using the methods of Section 3. In the following, we shall attempt to generalize the NLSM Lagrangian boundary conditions and boundary action (5.4) to the case of $U(1)^k$-GNLSMs with Kähler toric target space.

Let us elaborate further on how NLSM boundary data is obtained from GLSM boundary data. Hori [12] proposed to obtain Lagrangian boundary conditions and the boundary action (5.4) from a GLSM using boundary conditions given by

$$\overline{\Phi}_i e^{\hat{V}} \Phi_i = c_i \tag{5.5}$$

which includes the Dirichlet boundary condition

$$|\phi_i|^2 = c_i \tag{5.6}$$

and Neumann boundary conditions on φ_i (where φ_i is defined by $\phi_i = |\phi_i| e^{i\varphi_i}$), as well as the boundary Wilson line

$$S_a = \sum_i^N \int_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{a_i}{2\pi} \partial_0 \varphi_i \, dx^0, \tag{5.7}$$

(where a_i is a constant).[43] These indicate that at the GLSM level, the A-brane is wrapped on a torus parametrized by the φ_i's, which is a Lagrangian submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^N$, and where c_i

[43] Although a_i is a constant, Stoke's theorem does not result in the vanishing of (5.7), since φ_i is a periodic, multi-valued function [12].

is the radius of the circle parametrized by φ_i, while e^{ia_i} is the holonomy of the target space $U(1)$ gauge field along the circle parametrized by φ_i. However, if one were to impose the boundary condition (5.6) and its A-type supersymmetric completions at the GLSM level (e.g. for a $U(1)$ GLSM), taking the NLSM ($\hat{e} \to \infty$) limit and integrating out the vector multiplet components would impose constraints analogous to (3.20) and (3.21), which can only be shown to be compatible with A-type supersymmetry if $c_i = 0$. To avoid this, one uses 'boundary superfields' [12], whereby no boundary conditions are imposed by hand at the GLSM level, but rather they are understood as being derived through boundary interactions involving these boundary superfields.

We shall follow this method in deriving the GNLSM generalization of the boundary conditions and the boundary action (5.4). To this end, let us first briefly review the concept of boundary superfields [12], in particular those living in A-boundary superspace. The coordinates of A-boundary superspace are x^0, θ, $\overline{\theta}$, and boundary superfields are simply functions of these coordinates, and transform under A-type supersymmetry. Boundary superfields can be of both bosonic and fermionic nature.

The important differential operators on A-boundary superspace are ∂_0 and

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{D} &= \overline{D}_+ + D_- = -\frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{\theta}} + i\theta\partial_0, \\
D &= D_+ + \overline{D}_- = \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} - i\overline{\theta}\partial_0, \\
\overline{\mathcal{Q}} &= \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_+ + \mathcal{Q}_- = -\frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{\theta}} - i\theta\partial_0, \\
\mathcal{Q} &= \mathcal{Q}_+ + \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_- = \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} + i\overline{\theta}\partial_0.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Boundary superfields in A-boundary superspace transform under A-type supersymmetry by $\delta = \epsilon\overline{\mathcal{Q}} - \overline{\epsilon}\mathcal{Q}$. Bulk superfields restricted to A-boundary are boundary superfields. Furthermore, boundary *chiral* superfields obey

$$\overline{D}\,\Phi = 0, \tag{5.9}$$

and are expanded as

$$\Phi = \phi(x^0) + \theta\psi(x^0) - i\theta\overline{\theta}\partial_0\phi(x^0). \tag{5.10}$$

Following the convention of [12], fermionic boundary chiral superfields shall be referred to as boundary Fermi superfields. The integral

$$\int dx^0 d\theta d\overline{\theta}\, J(\mathcal{F}_i), \tag{5.11}$$

over a a function $J(\mathcal{F}_i)$ of boundary superfields $\mathcal{F}_i$ is invariant under A-type supersymmetry transformations. In addition, the integral

$$\int dx^0 d\theta\ \Psi\mathcal{V}(\Phi_i)\Big|_{\overline{\theta}=0}, \tag{5.12}$$

where Ψ is a a boundary Fermi superfield and $\mathcal{V}(\Phi_i)$ is a holomorphic function of boundary chiral superfields Φ_i, is also invariant under A-type supersymmetry. Expressions of the form (5.11) and (5.12) are known as boundary D-terms and boundary F-terms respectively.

Finally, we recall that only the axial R-symmetry of the bulk is preserved at the boundary, since vector R-rotations do not leave the A-boundary (defined by (5.3)) invariant.

A-branes on $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$ from GLSM

We shall first recall from [12] how the boundary conditions and the boundary action (5.4) for an NLSM with $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$ target space can be obtained from an A-type supersymmetric boundary action of a $U(1)$-GLSM with $\mathbb{C}^N$ target. The boundary action consists of two parts

$$S_1 = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int\limits_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left[\frac{1}{2}\sum_i^N \partial_1|\phi_i|^2 + \frac{i}{2}\sum_i^N(\overline{F}_i\phi_i - \overline{\phi}_i F_i) + \frac{i}{4\hat{e}^2}(\hat{\lambda}_-\hat{\lambda}_+ - \overline{\hat{\lambda}}_+\overline{\hat{\lambda}}_-) + \hat{\theta}\hat{A}_0\right] \tag{5.13}$$

and

$$S_2 = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_i^N \int\limits_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left[\int d\theta d\overline{\theta}\,\overline{\Phi}_i e^{\hat{V}}\Phi_i(U_i - \mathrm{Im}\log\Phi_i) + \mathrm{Re}\int d\theta\, s_i\Upsilon_i\right], \tag{5.14}$$

where U_i is a real, bosonic, boundary auxiliary superfield expanded as

$$U_i = u_i + \theta\overline{\mathcal{X}}_i - \overline{\theta}\mathcal{X}_i + \theta\overline{\theta}E_i \tag{5.15}$$

(with the lowest component u_i being a periodic (multivalued) scalar field defined on the boundary), $\Upsilon_i = \overline{D}U$ is the 'field-strength' of U_i, expanded as

$$\Upsilon_i := \overline{D}\,U_i = \mathcal{X}_i + \theta(E_i + i\partial_0 u_i) - i\theta\overline{\theta}\partial_0\mathcal{X}_i, \tag{5.16}$$

and is a boundary Fermi superfield satisfying $\overline{D}\Upsilon_i = 0$, while the parameter

$$s_i = c_i - ia_i \tag{5.17}$$

is the boundary analogue of the complex FI-theta parameter $\hat{t}$. It is important to note that although both u_i and φ_i are periodic, multi-valued functions, the presence of the term $\int d\theta d\overline{\theta}\,\overline{\Phi}_i e^{\hat{V}}\Phi_i(u_i - \varphi_i)$ in (5.14) requires that $u_i - \varphi_i$ is single-valued.

The first part (5.13), together with the bulk GLSM action, S, have the simple supersymmetry transformation

$$\delta(S + S_1) = \frac{\hat{r}}{4\pi}\int\limits_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left\{\epsilon(\overline{\hat{\lambda}}_+ + \hat{\lambda}_-) - \overline{\epsilon}(\overline{\hat{\lambda}}_- + \hat{\lambda}_+)\right\}, \tag{5.18}$$

The second part, (5.14), includes interactions which effectively impose boundary conditions on the components of the chiral multiplets. Let us recall how it transforms under supersymmetry. Gauge invariance of the first term in (5.14), requires that U_i transforms under gauge transformations as

$$U_i \longrightarrow U_i + \frac{\hat{Q}_i}{2}(A + \overline{A}), \tag{5.19}$$

in order to cancel the gauge variation of Im log Φ_i. This implies the following modification of the supersymmetry transformations of the components of U_i in order to preserve the Wess-Zumino gauge

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta u_i &= \epsilon \mathcal{X}_i - \overline{\epsilon}\overline{\mathcal{X}}_i, \\
\delta \mathcal{X}_i &= -\overline{\epsilon}(E_i + i(\partial_0 u_i + \hat{Q}_i \hat{A}_0)) - i\epsilon \hat{Q}_i \hat{\sigma}, \\
\delta \overline{\mathcal{X}}_i &= -\epsilon(E_i - i(\partial_0 u_i + \hat{Q}_i A_0)) + i\overline{\epsilon}\hat{Q}_i \overline{\hat{\sigma}}, \\
\delta E_i &= i\epsilon\partial_0 \mathcal{X}_i + i\overline{\epsilon}\partial_0 \overline{\mathcal{X}}_i - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon \hat{Q}_i(\hat{\lambda}_- + \overline{\hat{\lambda}}_+) + \frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}\hat{Q}_i(\overline{\hat{\lambda}}_- + \hat{\lambda}_+).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

Under these supersymmetry transformations, the boundary superpotential term

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_i^N \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \ \mathrm{Re} \int d\theta \, s_i \Upsilon_i = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_i^N \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \, (c_i E_i + a_i \partial_0 u_i) \tag{5.21}$$

is not invariant,[44] but rather varies as

$$\delta\left[\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_i^N \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \, \mathrm{Re} \int d\theta \, s_i \Upsilon_i\right] = -\frac{\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_i c_i}{4\pi} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left\{\epsilon(\overline{\hat{\lambda}}_+ + \hat{\lambda}_-) - \overline{\epsilon}(\overline{\hat{\lambda}}_- + \hat{\lambda}_+)\right\}. \tag{5.22}$$

Supersymmetry invariance of the entire action then requires that (5.18) and (5.22) cancel, which is possible if and only if

$$\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_i c_i = \hat{r}. \tag{5.23}$$

Similarly, the first part (5.13) of the boundary action is not gauge invariant, but varies as

$$\delta S_1 = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \hat{\theta}(-\partial_0 \alpha), \tag{5.24}$$

while (5.21) varies under gauge transformations as

$$\delta\left[\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_i^N \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \, \mathrm{Re} \int d\theta \, s_i \Upsilon_i\right] = \frac{\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_i a_i}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \partial_0 \alpha, \tag{5.25}$$

since the residual gauge transformation $A = \alpha(x)$ of the Wess-Zumino gauge shifts $u_i \to u_i + \hat{Q}_i \alpha$, while leaving $\mathcal{X}_i$ and E_i invariant. Thus, gauge invariance of the boundary action follows if and only if[45]

$$\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_i a_i = \hat{\theta}. \tag{5.26}$$

[44] The reason for this nonzero variation is that the boundary Fermi superfield Υ is not invariant under the gauge transformation (5.19).

[45] To be precise, (5.26) only needs to hold up to the additional term $2\pi m$, where $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, since the *path integral* remains gauge invariant in such cases [12]. However, we shall set $m = 0$ in the following for simplicity.

Combining, (5.23) and (5.26), we find that we need

$$\sum_i^N \hat{Q}_i s_i = \hat{t} \tag{5.27}$$

for gauge invariance and A-type supersymmetry invariance of the action.

To analyze the $\hat{e} \to \infty$ limit, it is advantageous to write the boundary action explicitly[46]

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\partial\Sigma} &= S_1 + S_2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \Big(\frac{i}{4\hat{e}^2}(\hat{\lambda}_-\hat{\lambda}_+ - \overline{\hat{\lambda}}_+\overline{\hat{\lambda}}_-) + \hat{\theta}\hat{A}_0 \Big) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_i^N \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \Big((i\overline{\phi}_i \overleftrightarrow{\hat{D}}_1 \phi_i + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{+i} - \overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{-i} + \overline{F}_i\phi_i + \overline{\phi}_i F_i)u_i' \\ &+ (\overline{\phi}_i\psi_{-i} + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\phi_i)\overline{\mathcal{X}}_i + \mathcal{X}_i(\overline{\psi}_{-i}\phi_i + \overline{\phi}_i\psi_{+i}) - i\frac{3}{2}\frac{\overline{\phi}_i}{\phi_i}\psi_{+i}\psi_{-i} + i\frac{3}{2}\frac{\phi_i}{\overline{\phi}_i}\overline{\psi}_{-i}\overline{\psi}_{+i} \\ &- (|\phi_i|^2 - c_i)E_i + a_i\partial_0 u_i \Big) \end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

where $u_i' = u_i - \varphi_i$, and where the covariant derivative of the scalar field is $\hat{D}_1\phi_i = \partial_0\phi_i + i\hat{Q}_i\hat{A}_1\phi_i$. Firstly, we note that Stoke's theorem implies

$$\frac{a_i}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} \partial_0 u_i dx^0 = \frac{a_i}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} \Big\{ \partial_0\varphi_i + \partial_0(u_i - \varphi_i) \Big\} dx^0 = \frac{a_i}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} \partial_0\varphi_i dx^0, \tag{5.29}$$

since $u_i - \varphi_i$ is single-valued, and we find that one of the terms in the boundary action is the expression (5.7). Then, taking $\hat{e} \to \infty$, and integrating out the boundary auxiliary superfields, we are left with

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \Big(\sum_i^N a_i\partial_0\varphi_i + \hat{\theta}\hat{A}_0 \Big), \tag{5.30}$$

with the boundary conditions defined by (5.5) imposed at the boundaries. These boundary conditions are given explicitly as

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_i|^2 &= c_i, \\ \overline{\phi}_i\psi_{-i} + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\phi_i &= 0, \\ \overline{\psi}_{-i}\phi_i + \overline{\phi}_i\psi_{+i} &= 0, \\ i\overline{\phi}_i \overleftrightarrow{\hat{D}}_1\phi_i + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{+i} - \overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{-i} + \overline{F}_i\phi_i + \overline{\phi}_i F_i &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.31}$$

Integrating the vector multiplet out of the bulk action sets

$$\hat{A}_0 = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{Q}_i(i\overline{\phi}_i \overleftrightarrow{\partial_0}\phi_i + \overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{-i} + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{+i})}{\sum_{j=1}^N \hat{Q}_j^2|\phi_j|^2} = -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{Q}_i c_i \partial_0\varphi_i}{\sum_{j=1}^N \hat{Q}_j^2 c_j}, \tag{5.32}$$

[46] Note that some terms in (5.13) cancel terms in (5.14).

at the boundary, where (5.31) has been used in the last step.[47] Thus, the final boundary action is

$$S_{\partial\Sigma} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i d\varphi_i - \hat{\theta}\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N}\hat{Q}_i c_i d\varphi_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{N}\hat{Q}_j^2 c_j}\right]. \tag{5.33}$$

It will be useful for us to analyze Hori's results (5.31) and (5.33) for $X = \mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, which corresponds to $\hat{Q}_i = 1$. Firstly, the inhomogeneous coordinates (3.26) which parametrize a local patch of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ can be written as

$$|Z^i|e^{i\gamma^i} = \frac{|\phi_i|e^{i\varphi_i}}{|\phi_N|e^{i\varphi_N}}. \tag{5.34}$$

In other words, the argument of Z^i is

$$\gamma^i = \varphi_i - \varphi_N. \tag{5.35}$$

The A-type supersymmetric boundary conditions of the NLSM which can be obtained from (5.31) using the parametrizations (3.25) and (3.27) are[48]

$$\begin{aligned} |Z^i|^2 &= \frac{c_i}{c_N} \\ \overline{Z}^i\psi_-^{Z^i} + Z^i\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{Z}^i} &= 0 \\ \overline{Z}^i\psi_+^{Z^i} + Z^i\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{Z}^i} &= 0 \\ i(\overline{Z}^i\partial_1 Z^i - Z^i\partial_1\overline{Z}^i) + \overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{Z}^i}\psi_+^{Z^i} - \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{Z}^i}\psi_-^{Z^i} + F^{Z^i}\overline{Z}^i + \overline{F}^{\overline{Z}^i}Z^i &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

where the last condition is in fact a Neumann boundary condition on γ^i, since $\overline{Z}^i\partial_1 Z^i - Z^i\partial_1\overline{Z}^i = 2|Z^i|^2 i\partial_1\gamma^i$. Thus, the Neumann boundary condition on γ^i and Dirichlet boundary condition on $|Z^i|$ in (5.36) implies that the A-brane wraps a torus T^{N-1} parametrized by γ_i. Moreover, this torus is a Lagrangian submanifold of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ with respect to the Fubini-Study Kähler form given by (4.26).

[47] The presence of the boundary term proportional to $\hat{\theta}\hat{A}_0$ ensures that the algebraic equation of motion for $\hat{A}_0$ does not contain a boundary term, see footnote 15.

[48] To be precise, the last condition of (5.31) is actually trivialized using the algebraic equation of motion of $\hat{A}_1$. The last condition of (5.36) is in fact obtained via A-type supersymmetry transformations of the fermionic boundary conditions.

We can rewrite the boundary action (5.33) with the help of (5.35) as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\partial\Sigma} &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[a_i - \hat{\theta}\frac{c_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{N}c_j}\right]d\varphi_i \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N-1}\left(a_i - (\sum_{k=1}^{N}a_k)\frac{c_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{N}c_j}\right)d\varphi_i + \left(a_N - (\sum_{k=1}^{N}a_k)\frac{c_N}{\sum_{j=1}^{N}c_j}\right)d\varphi_N\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N-1}\left(a_i - (\sum_{k=1}^{N}a_k)\frac{c_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{N}c_j}\right)d(\varphi_i - \varphi_N)\right] \\ &= \int_{\partial\Sigma}\sum_{i=1}^{N-1}A_i^X d\gamma^i, \end{aligned} \tag{5.37}$$

where we have also used (5.26), and defined the constant

$$A_i^X = \frac{1}{2\pi}\Big(a_i - (\sum_{k=1}^{N}a_k)\frac{c_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{N}c_j}\Big), \tag{5.38}$$

which is understood to be the connection of a flat $U(1)$ bundle on the Lagrangian torus T^{N-1} parametrized by γ_i. In other words, the A-brane, defined by the boundary conditions (5.36) and boundary action (5.37), wraps a Lagrangian submanifold of $X = \mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ and supports a flat $U(1)$ bundle. This corresponds to the data of an object in the Fukaya category of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ [25]. Supersymmetry invariance of the boundary action (5.37) follows since the fermionic superpartners of γ^i are not periodic nor multivalued ([8], page 307), hence, the supersymmetry variation of (5.37) vanishes via Stoke's theorem.

We have thus derived the boundary action (5.4) and the pertinent boundary conditions for $X = \mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ from a GLSM. Similarly, for other toric manifolds $X = \mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$, we may use the same techniques shown above to find that the A-brane wraps a torus T^{N-1} which is a Lagrangian submanifold of X, and supports a flat $U(1)$ bundle [12].

5.1 Equivariant A-branes on $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$ from GLSM

We shall now proceed to obtain the A-type supersymmetric boundary conditions and boundary action for abelian GNLSMs with toric target spaces of the form $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$. In order to do so, we must generalize the $U(1)$-GLSM boundary action consisting of (5.13) and (5.14) to a boundary action for the $U(1)^N$-GLSM given in (3.13), with $N - k = 1$.

The first step would be the obvious generalization of the terms with vector multiplet fields, i.e., from $U(1)$ to $U(1)^N$. Next, we note that in obtaining a $U(1)^{N-1}$-GNLSM from the $U(1)^N$-GLSM, we do not integrate out all vector multiplets, unlike in the procedure of obtaining the NLSM. However, the boundary action (5.14) only imposes boundary conditions on the matter fields in the $\hat{e} \to \infty$ limit. This implies that we ought to include additional boundary interactions at the GLSM level, which impose boundary conditions on the remaining vector multiplet fields in the $\hat{e} \to \infty$ limit. We claim that the $U(1)^N$-GLSM

boundary action consists of

$$S_1 = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left[\frac{1}{2}\sum_i^N \partial_1|\phi_i|^2 + \frac{i}{2}\sum_i^N(\overline{F}_i\phi_i - \overline{\phi}_i F_i) + \sum_a^N \frac{i}{4{e_a}^2}(\lambda_{-a}\lambda_{+a} - \overline{\lambda}_{+a}\overline{\lambda}_{-a}) + \sum_a^N \theta_a A_{0a} \right] \tag{5.39}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 =& \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_i^N \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left[\int d\theta d\overline{\theta}\, \overline{\Phi}_i e^{\sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}V_a}\Phi_i(U_i - \mathrm{Im}\log\Phi_i) + \mathrm{Re}\int d\theta\, s_i\Upsilon_i \right. \\ &\left. + \sum_a^N \frac{1}{2e_a^2}\int d\theta d\overline{\theta}\mathrm{Re}\big[\Xi_a(D_+\Sigma_a - \overline{D}_-\Sigma_a)\big] \right], \end{aligned} \tag{5.40}$$

where we have included a A-type supersymmetry invariant boundary D-term for the vector superfields, which contains the complex boundary Fermi superfields

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_a &= \xi_a + \theta G_a + \overline{\theta}H_a + \theta\overline{\theta}\mathcal{K}_a \\ \overline{\Xi}_a &= \overline{\xi}_a + \theta\overline{G}_a + \overline{\theta H}_a + \overline{\theta}\theta\overline{\mathcal{K}}_a, \end{aligned} \tag{5.41}$$

where ξ_a and $\mathcal{K}_a$ are fermionic auxiliary fields while G_a and H_a are bosonic auxiliary fields, all defined along the boundaries. The A-type supersymmetry transformations of these fields may be found using the differential operator $\delta = \epsilon\overline{\mathcal{Q}} - \overline{\epsilon}\mathcal{Q}$ defined in (5.8) on the superfields Ξ_a and $\overline{\Xi}_a$. In addition, they are defined to be invariant under gauge transformations. The form of (5.40) is chosen such that the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\Phi}_i e^{\sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}V_a}\Phi_i &= c_i \\ D_+\Sigma_a &= \overline{D}_-\Sigma_a \\ D_+\overline{\Sigma}_a &= \overline{D}_-\overline{\Sigma}_a \end{aligned} \tag{5.42}$$

are effectively imposed via boundary interactions. In components, these are

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_i|^2 &= c_i, \\ \overline{\phi}_i\psi_{-i} + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\phi_i &= 0, \\ \overline{\psi}_{-i}\phi_i + \overline{\phi}_i\psi_{+i} &= 0, \\ i\overline{\phi}_i \overleftrightarrow{D}_1\phi_i + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{+i} - \overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{-i} + \overline{F}_i\phi_i + \overline{\phi}_i F_i &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{5.43}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{+a} - \overline{\lambda}_{-a} &= 0, \\ \partial_1\sigma_a &= 0, \\ F_{01a} &= 0, \\ D_a &= 0, \\ \partial_1(\lambda_{+a} + \overline{\lambda}_{-a}) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.44}$$

The supersymmetry transformation of the bulk GLSM action together with (5.39) is

$$\delta(S + S_1) = \sum_a^N \frac{r_a}{4\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left\{\epsilon(\overline{\lambda}_{+a} + \lambda_{-a}) - \overline{\epsilon}(\overline{\lambda}_{-a} + \lambda_{+a})\right\}. \tag{5.45}$$

Now, $U(1)^N$ gauge invariance of the first term in (5.40), requires that U_i transforms under $U(1)^N$ gauge transformations as

$$U_i \longrightarrow U_i + \sum_a^N \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{ia}}{2}(A_a + \overline{A}_a), \tag{5.46}$$

in order to cancel the gauge variation of Im log Φ_i. This implies the following modification of the supersymmetry transformations of the components of U_i in order to preserve the Wess-Zumino gauge

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta u_i &= \epsilon \mathcal{X}_i - \overline{\epsilon}\overline{\mathcal{X}}_i, \\
\delta \mathcal{X}_i &= -\overline{\epsilon}(E_i + i(\partial_0 u_i + \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} A_{0a})) - i\epsilon \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}\sigma_a, \\
\delta \overline{\mathcal{X}}_i &= -\epsilon(E_i - i(\partial_0 u_i + \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} A_{0a})) + i\overline{\epsilon} \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}\overline{\sigma}_a, \\
\delta E_i &= i\epsilon\partial_0 \mathcal{X}_i + i\overline{\epsilon}\partial_0 \overline{\mathcal{X}}_i - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}(\lambda_{-a} + \overline{\lambda}_{+a}) + \frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon} \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}(\overline{\lambda}_{-a} + \lambda_{+a}).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.47}$$

The boundary superpotential term in (5.40) is not invariant under supersymmetry,[49] but rather varies as

$$\delta \left[\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_i^N \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \,\mathrm{Re} \int d\theta \, s_i \Upsilon_i \right] = -\frac{\sum_a^N \sum_i^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} c_i}{4\pi} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left\{ \epsilon(\overline{\lambda}_{+a} + \lambda_{-a}) - \overline{\epsilon}(\overline{\lambda}_{-a} + \lambda_{+a}) \right\}. \tag{5.48}$$

Hence, supersymmetry invariance of the entire action requires that (5.45) and (5.48) cancel, which is possible if and only if

$$\sum_i^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} c_i = r_a. \tag{5.49}$$

Likewise, the first part (5.39) of the boundary action is not $U(1)^N$-gauge invariant, but varies as

$$\delta S_1 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \sum_a^N \theta_a(-\partial_0 \alpha_a), \tag{5.50}$$

while the boundary superpotential term varies under gauge transformations as

$$\delta \left[\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_i^N \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \,\mathrm{Re} \int d\theta \, s_i \Upsilon_i \right] = \frac{\sum_a^N \sum_i^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} a_i}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \partial_0 \alpha_a, \tag{5.51}$$

since the residual gauge transformation $A_a = \alpha_a(x)$ of the Wess-Zumino gauge shifts $u_i \to u_i + \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}\alpha_a$, while leaving $\mathcal{X}_i$ and E_i invariant. Therefore, gauge invariance

[49] This nonzero variation occurs because the boundary Fermi superfield Υ is not invariant under the gauge transformation (5.46).

of the boundary action follows if and only if[50]

$$\sum_i^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} a_i = \theta_a. \tag{5.52}$$

Combining (5.49) and (5.52), we find that we need

$$\sum_i^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} s_i = t_a \tag{5.53}$$

for gauge invariance and A-type supersymmetry invariance of the action.

Expanding the boundary action in components, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\partial\Sigma} &= S_1 + S_2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left(\sum_a^N \frac{i}{4{e_a}^2}(\lambda_{-a}\lambda_{+a} - \overline{\lambda}_{+a}\overline{\lambda}_{-a}) + \sum_a^N \theta_a A_{0a} \right) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_i^N \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \Big((i\overline{\phi}_i \overleftrightarrow{D}_1 \phi_i + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{+i} - \overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{-i} + \overline{F}_i\phi_i + \overline{\phi}_i F_i)u_i' \\
&+ (\overline{\phi}_i\psi_{-i} + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\phi_i)\overline{\mathcal{X}}_i + \mathcal{X}_i(\overline{\psi}_{-i}\phi_i + \overline{\phi}_i\psi_{+i}) - i\frac{3}{2}\frac{\overline{\phi}_i}{\phi_i}\psi_{+i}\psi_{-i} + i\frac{3}{2}\frac{\phi_i}{\overline{\phi}_i}\overline{\psi}_{-i}\overline{\psi}_{+i} \\
&- (|\phi_i|^2 - c_i)E_i + a_i\partial_0 u_i \Big) \\
&+ \sum_a^N \frac{1}{2e_a^2}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \frac{1}{2}\Big(\xi_a\Big(\partial_0(\lambda_{-a} - \overline{\lambda}_{+a}) + 2\partial_1(\lambda_{-a} + \overline{\lambda}_{+a})\Big) \\
&+ i2G_a(\partial_1\sigma_a) - 2H_a(D_a - iF_{01a}) + i\mathcal{K}_a(\lambda_{-a} - \overline{\lambda}_{+a}) + c.c. \Big),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.54}$$

where the covariant derivative of the scalar fields is given in (3.14). Performing the manipulation given in (5.29), taking the $\hat{e} \to \infty$ limit, and subsequently integrating out the boundary auxiliary fields, we obtain the boundary action

$$S_{\partial\Sigma} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \Big(\sum_i^N a_i\partial_0\varphi_i + \hat{\theta}\hat{A}_0 + \sum_c^{N-1} \widetilde{\theta}_c \widetilde{A}_{0c} \Big), \tag{5.55}$$

together with boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned}
|\phi_i|^2 &= c_i, \\
\overline{\phi}_i\psi_{-i} + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\phi_i &= 0, \\
\overline{\psi}_{-i}\phi_i + \overline{\phi}_i\psi_{+i} &= 0, \\
i\overline{\phi}_i \overleftrightarrow{D}_1 \phi_i + \overline{\psi}_{+i}\psi_{+i} - \overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{-i} + \overline{F}_i\phi_i + \overline{\phi}_i F_i &= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{5.56}$$

[50] As noted in footnote 45, (5.52) only needs to hold up to the additional term $2\pi m$, but we shall set $m = 0$ in the following for simplicity.

on the matter fields, as well as boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\lambda}_{+c} - \overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{-c} &= 0, \\ \partial_1 \widetilde{\sigma}_c &= 0, \\ \widetilde{F}_{01c} &= 0, \\ \widetilde{D}_c &= 0, \\ \partial_1(\widetilde{\lambda}_{+c} + \overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{-c}) &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{5.57}$$

on vector multiplet fields, and their complex conjugates. In superfield notation, the latter are

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\Phi}_i e^{\sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} V_a} \Phi_i &= c_i \\ D_+ \widetilde{\Sigma}_c &= \overline{D}_- \Sigma_c \\ D_+ \overline{\widetilde{\Sigma}}_c &= \overline{D}_- \overline{\widetilde{\Sigma}}_c. \end{aligned} \tag{5.58}$$

Before proceeding, we note that the boundary conditions on the matter fermion fields in (5.56) ensure that the spurious boundary term (3.34) vanishes.

Now, we shall rewrite (5.55) as

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \Big(\sum_i^N a_i \widetilde{D}_0 \varphi_i + \hat{\theta} \hat{A}_0 \Big), \tag{5.59}$$

where we have used $\sum_i^N \widetilde{Q}_{ic} a_i = \widetilde{\theta}_c$ and where the covariant derivative of φ_i is

$$\widetilde{D}_0 \varphi_i = \partial_0 \varphi_i + \sum_c^{N-1} \widetilde{Q}_{ic} \widetilde{A}_{0c}, \tag{5.60}$$

which agrees with the general definition for scalar fields given in (2.9). By integrating the vector multiplet out of the bulk action (c.f. (3.20)), we obtain

$$\hat{A}_0 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{Q}_i (i\overline{\phi}_i \overleftrightarrow{\widetilde{D}_0} \phi_i + \overline{\psi}_{-i} \psi_{-i} + \overline{\psi}_{+i} \psi_{+i})}{\sum_{j=1}^N \hat{Q}_j^2 |\phi_j|^2} = - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{Q}_i c_i \widetilde{D}_0 \varphi_i}{\sum_{j=1}^N \hat{Q}_j^2 c_j}, \tag{5.61}$$

at the boundary,[51] where (5.56) has been used in the last step. Hence, the final boundary action is[52]

$$S_{\partial\Sigma} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left[\sum_{i=1}^N a_i \widetilde{D}_0 \varphi_i - \hat{\theta} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{Q}_i c_i \widetilde{D}_0 \varphi_i}{\sum_{j=1}^N \hat{Q}_j^2 c_j} \right]. \tag{5.62}$$

[51] As in the NLSM case, the presence of the boundary term proportional to $\hat{\theta}\hat{A}_0$ ensures that the algebraic equation of motion for $\hat{A}_0$ does not contain a boundary term, see footnote 15.

[52] To be precise, the complete boundary action includes the C-field term given in (2.7). However, to simplify the following arguments, we shall consider the C-field term to be part of the bulk action, by using Stoke's theorem to promote it to a bulk term.

Now, let us investigate the example of $X = \mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$. We can derive the A-type supersymmetric boundary conditions of the GNLSM matter fields from (5.56) using the parametrizations (3.25) and (3.27)[53]

$$\begin{aligned} |Z^i|^2 &= \frac{c_i}{c_N} \\ \overline{Z}^i \psi_-^{Z^i} + Z^i \overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{Z}^i} &= 0 \\ \overline{Z}^i \psi_+^{Z^i} + Z^i \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{Z}^i} &= 0 \\ i(\overline{Z}^i \partial_1^A Z^i - Z^i \partial_1^A \overline{Z}^i) + \overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{Z}^i} \psi_+^{Z^i} - \overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{Z}^i} \psi_-^{Z^i} + F^{Z^i} \overline{Z}^i + \overline{F}^{\overline{Z}^i} Z^i &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{5.63}$$

where the last condition is in fact a Neumann boundary condition on γ^i, since $\overline{Z}^i \partial_1^A Z^i - Z^i \partial_1^A \overline{Z}^i = 2|Z^i|^2 i \partial_1^A \gamma^i$, where

$$\partial_\mu^A \gamma^i = \partial_\mu \gamma^i + \sum_c^{N-1} (\widetilde{Q}_{ic} - \widetilde{Q}_{Nc}) \widetilde{A}_{\mu c} = \partial_\mu \gamma^i + \sum_c^{N-1} \widetilde{e}_c^{\gamma^i} \widetilde{A}_{\mu c}, \tag{5.64}$$

with $\widetilde{e}_c^{\gamma^i}$ being the Killing vector field which generates the $U(1)^{N-1}$ isometry of the torus, T^{N-1}, parametrized by γ_i. The Neumann boundary condition on γ^i together with the Dirichlet boundary condition on $|Z^i|$ implies that the equivariant A-brane wraps this torus. Furthermore, this torus is a Lagrangian submanifold of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ with respect to the Fubini-Study Kähler form given by (4.26). The remaining boundary conditions, i.e., for the fields in the vector multiplet of the GNLSM are given by (5.57). The complete set of GNLSM boundary conditions is invariant under the $U(1)^{N-1}$ gauge symmetry, and satisfy the supersymmetry transformations given in (2.30) and (2.31) for $\epsilon_+ = \overline{\epsilon}_-$. In addition, the boundary conditions also ensure the locality of the classical equations of motion, i.e., that they contain no boundary terms.

Next, with the aid of (5.35), we can rewrite the boundary action (5.62) as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\partial\Sigma} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[a_i - \hat{\theta} \frac{c_i}{\sum_{j=1}^N c_j} \right] \widetilde{D}_0 \varphi_i \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left(a_i - (\sum_{k=1}^{N} a_k) \frac{c_i}{\sum_{j=1}^N c_j} \right) \widetilde{D}_0 \varphi_i + \left(a_N - (\sum_{k=1}^{N} a_k) \frac{c_N}{\sum_{j=1}^N c_j} \right) \widetilde{D}_0 \varphi_N \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left(a_i - (\sum_{k=1}^{N} a_k) \frac{c_i}{\sum_{j=1}^N c_j} \right) \left(\partial_0 (\varphi_i - \varphi_N) + \sum_c^{N-1} (\widetilde{Q}_{ic} - \widetilde{Q}_{Nc}) \widetilde{A}_{0c} \right) \right] \\ &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} A_i^X \partial_0 \gamma^i - \sum_{c=1}^{N-1} \widetilde{R}_c \widetilde{A}_{0c} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{5.65}$$

[53] Analogous to the NLSM case, the last condition of (5.56) is trivialized using the algebraic equation of motion of $\hat{A}_1$ in (3.20). The last condition of (5.63) is obtained via A-type supersymmetry transformations of the fermionic boundary conditions.

where we have also used (5.26), and where A_i^X is the constant given in (5.38), which is the connection of a flat $U(1)$ bundle on the Lagrangian torus T^{N-1} parametrized by γ_i, and where

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{R}_c &= -\sum_i^{N-1}(\widetilde{Q}_{ic} - \widetilde{Q}_{Nc})A_i^X \\ &= -\sum_i^{N-1}\widetilde{e}_c^{\gamma^i}A_i^X \\ &= -\iota_{\widetilde{e}_c}A^X.\end{aligned} \tag{5.66}$$

As we explain below, A-type supersymmetry invariance holds if and only if

$$d\widetilde{R} = \iota_{\widetilde{e}}F^X, \tag{5.67}$$

which is equal to zero since $F^X = 0$. This is known as the *equivariant* Bianchi identity, and implies that the flat $U(1)$ bundle has $U(1)^{N-1}$-*equivariant* structure,[54] for which $\widetilde{R}_c$ is the *moment* [21, 22].

Now, the boundary action (5.65) is not invariant under the supersymmetry transformations (2.30) and (2.31) for $\epsilon_+ = \overline{\epsilon}_-$. Instead, the *total action* $S + S_{\partial\Sigma}$ is invariant under these transformations at the boundaries, using the boundary conditions (5.63) and (5.57), and therefore the sum of the expressions (2.33), (2.34) and (2.35) with the supersymmetry variation of the boundary action vanishes. The proof of this involves the supersymmetry invariance of the constant $\widetilde{R}$, which is essentially the equivariant Bianchi identity (5.67), as well as the boundary constraint

$$\widetilde{\mu}_c = -\widetilde{r}_c \tag{5.68}$$

on the moment map, which can be derived from (5.23) using $c_i = |\phi_i|^2$ and the parametrization (3.25). Furthermore, the nonzero supersymmetry variation of the boundary action (5.65) is cancelled by the C-term in (2.35) and the $\widetilde{\theta}_c$-term in (2.34) via

$$2\pi\widetilde{R}_c = -\widetilde{\theta}_c + \phi^* C_c, \tag{5.69}$$

which can be shown to hold via (3.33), (5.68), and (5.53). Finally, the B-term in (2.35) vanishes since the B-field is proportional to the Kähler form, which vanishes when contracted with the pullback of tangent vectors on the Lagrangian submanifold on which the equivariant A-brane is wrapped.

Next, writing the boundary action as

$$S_{\partial\Sigma} = \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} A_i^X \partial_0^A \gamma^i \right), \tag{5.70}$$

it becomes obvious that it is invariant under the gauge transformations given in (2.25) and (2.26), since A_i^X is a constant and the expression $\partial_0^A\gamma^i$ is invariant under gauge transformations.

[54] The G-equivariant Bianchi identity is equivalent to the G-invariance of the connection, A, of the bundle ($\mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}}A = 0$), which implies that the covariant derivative $d + A$ is G-invariant, and this defines a G-equivariant bundle, see [22], Section 3.2.

We have thus found A-type supersymmetric and $U(1)^{N-1}$ gauge invariant boundary conditions and boundary interactions corresponding to an equivariant A-brane in $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, which wraps a Lagrangian submanifold T^{N-1} which supports a $U(1)^{N-1}$-equivariant flat $U(1)$ bundle. We may follow a procedure analogous to that presented above for $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ in order to describe an equivariant A-brane in a toric manifold $X = \mathbb{C}^N//U(1)$ (by choosing different values for $\hat{Q}_i$), which would again be a Lagrangian submanifold T^{N-1} supporting a flat $U(1)$ bundle with $U(1)^{N-1}$-equivariant structure.

5.2 Equivariant A-branes on $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ from GLSM

We can generalize further, since the examples above have been solely for equivariant A-branes on $X = \mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ where $N - k = 1$. For general values of $N - k$, we may derive the relevant boundary conditions and boundary action from the GLSM boundary action (5.54), but instead of taking the $\hat{e} \to \infty$ limit for a single gauge group, we take $\hat{e}_b \to \infty$, where $b = 1, \ldots, N - k$. Integrating out auxiliary fields, and using parametrizations analogous to (3.25), we will be able to derive the $U(1)^k$-GNLSM boundary conditions and boundary action which represent an equivariant A-brane wrapping a Lagrangian torus T^k, which supports a flat $U(1)$ bundle with $U(1)^k$-equivariant structure.

Kapustin et al. ([15], page 58) have conjectured that the category of G-equivariant A-branes is some sort of G-equivariant version of the Fukaya category. Indeed, if we generalize the definition of the equivariant Fukaya category given for *finite* groups by Cho and Hong ([26], page 69) to $G = U(1)^k$, we see that the equivariant A-branes which we have found are the simplest objects in the $U(1)^k$-equivariant Fukaya category, and therefore, we have partially verified the conjecture of Kapustin et al. The other objects in the category which we have not constructed correspond to Lagrangian submanifolds which support equivariant flat unitary vector bundles.

5.3 Quantum Corrections

There are two important quantum effects of the $U(1)^{N-k} \times U(1)^k$ GLSM, which affect the FI parameters r_a and theta angles θ_a [8].[55] The first effect is the renormalization of the FI parameters,

$$r_{0a} = r_a(\mu) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{Q}_{ia} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{UV}}}{\mu}\right), \tag{5.71}$$

where r_{0a} denotes bare parameters, Λ_{UV} is an ultraviolet cut-off, and μ is a finite energy scale. Via integration of the beta functions of the FI parameters, $\beta_a = \mu \frac{dr_a}{d\mu}$, the μ-dependence is found to be

$$r_a(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{Q}_{ia} \log\left(\frac{\mu}{\Lambda}\right), \tag{5.72}$$

where Λ is the renormalization group invariant dynamical scale. The second quantum effect is the anomaly of the bulk $U(1)$ axial R-symmetry, whereby axial R-rotations $\psi_{\pm i} \to$

[55] The following is a generalization of the results of Section 4.3 of [12] to the case of multiple $U(1)$ gauge groups.

$e^{\pm i\beta/2}\psi_{\pm i}$, $\sigma_a \to e^{-i\beta}\sigma_a$ and $\lambda_{\pm a} \to e^{\pm i\beta/2}\lambda_{\pm a}$ no longer leave the action invariant, but result in a shift of the theta angles, i.e.,

$$\theta_a \to \theta_a + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{Q}_{ia}\beta. \tag{5.73}$$

Since these parameters are closely related to the boundary parameters c_i and a_i, via (5.49) and (5.52), we may deduce the quantum effects on the boundary. The running of the FI parameters (5.72) together with (5.49) imply that c_i runs as

$$c_i(\mu) = \log\left(\frac{\mu}{\Lambda}\right). \tag{5.74}$$

Similarly, the effect of the bulk axial R-anomaly, which is the shift (5.73), can be used together with (5.52) to find the effect of the boundary axial R-anomaly, which is the shift of the parameters a_i, i.e.,

$$a_i \to a_i + \beta. \tag{5.75}$$

Note that these quantum effects are nontrivial even when $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{Q}_{ia} = 0$, unlike the quantum corrections to r_a and θ_a. In particular, (5.74) implies that the equivariant A-brane could disappear from the theory at low energies, since the Dirichlet boundary condition is $|Z^i|^2 = c_i/c_N$ [12]. However, this is only definitively the case when $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{Q}_{ia} = 0$. When $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{Q}_{ia} > 0$, the manifold X itself becomes smaller at low energy due to (5.72), since $\hat{r}_b$ are the size moduli of X (for $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, this is obvious from (3.28)), and there is a chance that the equivariant A-brane stays in the theory at low energies.

5.4 Mirrors of Equivariant A-branes

Having found the boundary conditions and boundary actions of GNLSMs corresponding to equivariant A-branes in toric manifolds, we shall now use mirror symmetry to find the Landau-Ginzburg mirrors of these branes, following the exposition in Section 3, as well as the results of [12]. We shall obtain the mirrors of branes in toric manifolds which obey $c_1(X) \geq 0$, since mirror symmetry is a *quantum* duality (which holds after taking all pertubative and nonpertubative quantum effects into account), and we can only obtain quantum GNLSMs for Kähler targets with $c_1(X) \geq 0$ from GLSMs (c.f. Section 3).

In the following analysis, we shall take $|\phi_i|^2$ to be non-zero. The boundary action of the $U(1)^N$ GLSM which we wish to dualize is given by (5.54), with $\sum_i^N a_i\partial_0 u_i$ replaced by $\sum_i^N a_i\partial_0\varphi_i$ via (5.29).[56] The terms in the full $U(1)^N$ GLSM action relevant for the dualization are those which involve φ_i:

$$\begin{aligned} S_\varphi = &-\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\int_\Sigma |\phi_i|^2(\partial_\mu\varphi_i + \sum_a \mathcal{Q}_{ia}A_{\mu a})^2 d^2x \\ &+\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(-2u_i'|\phi_i|^2(\partial_1\varphi_i + \sum_a \mathcal{Q}_{ia}A_{1a}) + a_i\partial_0\varphi_i\right) + \sum_a \theta_a A_{0a}\right]dx^0, \end{aligned} \tag{5.76}$$

[56] Note that $\varphi_i = \mathrm{Im}\,\log\,\phi_i$ is understood to be well-defined, permitting us to set $U_i = \varphi_i + U_i'$ whereby U_i' is a boundary superfield which is single-valued.

where $-2|\phi_i|^2(\partial_1\varphi_i+\sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}A_{1a}) = i\overline{\phi}_i \overleftrightarrow{D}_1 \phi_i$.[57] Here, the boundary theta term $\sum_a^N \frac{\theta_a}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} A_{0a}dx^0$ has been included in order to maintain the gauge invariance, i.e., the gauge transformations $\varphi_i \to \varphi_i + \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}\alpha_a$, $A_{\mu a} \to A_{\mu a} - \partial_\mu \alpha_a$ leave the expression (5.76) invariant (as long as (5.52) holds). All other terms, including those involving fermions, have been suppressed for simplicity.

Now, let us consider a system of N one form fields $(B_i)_\mu$, as well as $N+1$ periodic scalar fields consisting of ϑ_i and $\widetilde{u}$ with the action

$$S' = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^N \left[\int_\Sigma \left(-|\phi_i|^2|B_i|^2 d^2x + B_i \wedge d\vartheta_i - \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}\vartheta_i F_a \right) + \int_{\partial\Sigma} (a_i - \vartheta_i)\partial_0 \widetilde{u} dx^0 \right], \quad (5.77)$$

where F_a is the curvature of $A_a = A_{\mu a}dx^\mu$, $F_a = dA_a$. In addition, the boundary condition

$$(B_i)_1 = 0 \quad (5.78)$$

is imposed. Integrating out ϑ_i gives rise to the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} dB_i &= \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}F_a \quad \text{on } \Sigma \\ (B_i)_0 &= \partial_0 \widetilde{u} \quad \text{along } \partial\Sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (5.79)$$

The first of these constraints is solved by $B_i = d\varphi_i + \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}A$, where φ_i is a periodic scalar field of period 2π.[58] Then, the second constraint together with the boundary condition (5.78) implies the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_0\varphi_i + \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}A_{0a} &= \partial_0 \widetilde{u}, \\ \partial_1\varphi_i + \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}A_{1a} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.80)$$

on the boundary. Inserting the first expression of (5.80) into (5.77) we obtain the action (5.76) without the u_i'-dependent terms (using $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}a_i = \theta_a$). The second condition in (5.80) is equivalent to presence of the u_i'-dependent terms, since integrating out u_i' imposes the second equation of (5.80).

Alternatively, integrating out the fields B_i imposes

$$B_{i0} = \frac{-\partial_1\vartheta_i}{2|\phi_i|^2}, \quad (5.81)$$

$$B_{i1} = \frac{-\partial_0\vartheta_i}{2|\phi_i|^2}, \quad (5.82)$$

and we obtain

$$S_\vartheta = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^N \left[\int_\Sigma \left(-\frac{1}{2|\phi|^2}\partial_\mu\vartheta_i\partial^\mu\vartheta_i - \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia}\vartheta_i F_a \right) + \int_{\partial\Sigma} (a_i - \vartheta_i)\partial_0\widetilde{u}dx^0 \right]. \quad (5.83)$$

[57] The subsequent analysis follows from that given in [12], the only difference being that we have generalized the gauge group from $U(1)$ to $U(1)^N$.

[58] For details on why φ_i ought to be periodic, see [8], page 250.

The bulk portion of the full mirror action is given by (3.2) (modulo boundary terms that arise from putting the scalar kinetic terms in (3.2) in their standard form), and the relationship

$$Y_i + \overline{Y}_i = 2\overline{\Phi}_i e^{\sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} V_a} \Phi_i, \tag{5.84}$$

between the fields of the mirror theories, which was found in Section 3 for closed worldsheets, holds in this case. The expression (5.84) implies the following relationships between superfield components:

$$\begin{aligned}
y_i &= \varrho_i - i\vartheta_i, \begin{cases} \varrho_i = |\phi_i|^2, \\ \partial_\pm \vartheta_i = \pm 2\Big(-|\phi_i|^2(\partial_\pm \varphi_i + \sum_a^N \mathcal{Q}_{ia} A_{\pm a}) + \overline{\psi}_{\pm i}\psi_{\pm i}\Big), \end{cases} \\
\chi_{+i} &= 2\overline{\psi}_{+i}\phi_i, \;\; \chi_{-i} = -2\overline{\psi}_{-i}\phi_i, \\
\overline{\chi}_{+i} &= 2\overline{\phi}_i\psi_{+i}, \;\; \overline{\chi}_{-i} = -2\overline{\phi}_i\psi_{-i}, \\
E_i &= -2\overline{\psi}_{-i}\psi_{+i} - 2|\phi_i|^2 \sum_a \mathcal{Q}_{ia}\overline{\sigma}_a,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.85}$$

where $\partial_\pm = \partial_0 \pm \partial_1$, $Y_i = y_i + \theta^+\overline{\chi}_{+i} + \overline{\theta}^-\chi_{-i} + \theta^+\overline{\theta}^- E_i$ and φ_i is the 2π-periodic phase of $\phi_i = |\phi_i|\, e^{i\varphi_i}$. The relationship between the periodic fields ϑ_i and φ_i is in fact evidence that mirror symmetry of the two theories arises from T-duality on the phase of the charged chiral superfields Φ_i, whereby the neutral twisted chiral superfields Y_i are periodic, i.e., $Y_i \equiv Y_i + 2\pi i$ [8].

The full mirror boundary action is given by[59]

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\partial\Sigma} = {} & \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left(\sum_a^N \frac{i}{4{e_a}^2}(\lambda_{-a}\lambda_{+a} - \overline{\lambda}_{+a}\overline{\lambda}_{-a}) \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \,\mathrm{Re}\int d\theta\, (s_i - Y_i)\widetilde{\Upsilon}_i \\
& + \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i}^N \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left(i\frac{3}{8}\overline{\chi}_{+i}\overline{\chi}_{-i} - i\frac{3}{8}\chi_{-i}\chi_{+i} \right) \\
& + \sum_a^N \frac{1}{2e_a^2}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \frac{1}{2}\Big(\xi_a\Big(\partial_0(\lambda_{-a} - \overline{\lambda}_{+a}) + 2\partial_1(\lambda_{-a} + \overline{\lambda}_{+a})\Big) \\
& + i2G_a(\partial_1\sigma_a) - 2H_a(D_a - iF_{01a}) + i\mathcal{K}_a(\lambda_{-a} - \overline{\lambda}_{+a}) + c.c. \Big),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.86}$$

where the boundary term in (5.83) is contained in

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \,\mathrm{Re}\int d\theta\, (s_i - Y_i)\widetilde{\Upsilon}_i. \tag{5.87}$$

[59] As explained in [12], unlike the bulk superpotential $\sum_{i=1}^N e^{-Y_i}$ which is generated by instanton effects, no boundary F-terms can be generated by such effects.

Here, $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_i$ is the 'field strength' $\overline{D}\widetilde{U}_i$ of the boundary superfield $\widetilde{U}_i$, whose only difference from U_i is that its lowest component is $\tilde{u}_i$. Integrating out $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_i$, we find the boundary condition

$$Y_i = s_i, \tag{5.88}$$

at A-boundary, which is

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &= s_i \\ \overline{\chi}_{+i} - \chi_{-i} &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{5.89}$$

in components. In fact, integrating out *all* the boundary auxiliary fields in (5.86) imposes the boundary conditions (5.88) and (5.44), which result in the entire boundary action vanishing.

As in Section 3, taking the $\hat{e}_b \to \infty$ limit allows us to integrate $\hat{\Sigma}_b$ out of the action, and imposes the constraint

$$\sum_j^N \hat{Q}_{jb} Y_j - \hat{t}_b = 0, \tag{5.90}$$

giving us the gauged Landau-Ginzburg theory with holomorphic twisted superpotential

$$\widetilde{W} = \sum_c^k \Big(\sum_{j=1}^N \widetilde{Q}_{jc} Y_j - \widetilde{t}_c \Big) \widetilde{\Sigma}_c \ + \ \sum_{j=1}^N e^{-Y_j}. \tag{5.91}$$

We recall that the constraint (5.90) fixes the target space of the gauged Landau-Ginzburg theory to be the algebraic torus $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^k$. It is solved (c.f. Section 3) by

$$Y_j = \hat{s}_j + \sum_{c=1}^k v_{cj} \Theta_c, \tag{5.92}$$

where $\hat{s}_j$ is any solution of $\hat{Q}_j^b \hat{s}^j = \hat{t}^b$. Note that with $\Theta_c = \theta_c + \theta^+ \overline{\chi}^\theta_{+c} + \overline{\theta}^- \chi^\theta_{-c} + \theta^+ \overline{\theta}^- E^\theta_c$, the full mirror action, expanded in components is

$$\begin{aligned} S = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^2x \Big[& \sum_c^k \sum_d^k (-g_{cd} \partial_\mu \theta_c \partial^\mu \overline{\theta}_d + \frac{i}{2} g_{cd} \overline{\chi}^\theta_{-c} (\overleftrightarrow{\partial}_+) \chi^\theta_{-d} + \frac{i}{2} g_{cd} \overline{\chi}^\theta_{+c} (\overleftrightarrow{\partial}_-) \chi^\theta_{+d} + g_{cd} E^\theta_c \overline{E}^\theta_d) \\ & + \sum_c^k \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2} \Big((\widetilde{F}_{01c})^2 - \partial_\mu \widetilde{\sigma}_c \partial^\mu \overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c + (\widetilde{D}_c)^2 + \frac{i}{2} \overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{+c} (\overleftrightarrow{\partial}_-) \widetilde{\lambda}_{+c} + \frac{i}{2} \overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{-c} (\overleftrightarrow{\partial}_+) \widetilde{\lambda}_{-c} \Big) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \Big(\sum_j^N \sum_c^k \sum_d^k \widetilde{Q}_{jc} v_d^j (\widetilde{\sigma}_c E^\theta_d - i \overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{+c} \chi^\theta_{-d} - i \widetilde{\lambda}_{-c} \overline{\chi}^\theta_{+d} + (\widetilde{D}_c - i \widetilde{F}_{01c}) \theta_d) + (\widetilde{Q}_{jc} \hat{s}^j - \widetilde{t}_c)(\widetilde{D}_c - i \widetilde{F}_{01c}) \\ & + \sum_j^N e^{-\sum_c v_c^j \theta_c - \hat{s}^j} (- \sum_c^k v_c^j \overline{\chi}^\theta_{+c} \sum_d^k v_d^j \chi^\theta_{-d} - \sum_c^k v_c^j E^\theta_c) + c.c. \Big) \Big], \end{aligned} \tag{5.93}$$

where θ_c (the lowest component of Θ_c) parametrizes the mirror target space $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^k$, on which g_{cd} is the flat Kähler metric

$$g_{cd} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{\sum_j^N v_c^j v_d^j}{\log(\Lambda_{UV}/\mu)}. \tag{5.94}$$

Now, the boundary condition (5.88) on Y_i implies the boundary condition

$$\sum_{c=1}^{k} v_{cj}\Theta_c = s_j - \hat{s}_j, \tag{5.95}$$

and this means that the $U(1)^k$-equivariant A-brane in $X = \mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ is mapped to a B-brane which is a D0-brane in the mirror Landau-Ginzburg model located at θ_c, where θ_c is a solution of $\sum_{c=1}^{k} v_{cj}\theta_c = s_j - \hat{s}_j$.[60] Let us investigate this D0-brane further, by studying how it is described in the $\widetilde{W}$-plane. In particular, we would like to find the mirror of the $U(1)^k$-equivariant structure on the A-brane.

Firstly, we note that the twisted superpotential (5.91), which is a function of θ_c and $\widetilde{\sigma}_c$, can be rewritten as

$$\widetilde{W} = \widetilde{W}_{equiv} + \widetilde{W}_X. \tag{5.96}$$

where the first and second term of (5.91) correspond respectively to the first and second term of (5.96). The image of the D0-brane in the $\widetilde{W}_X$-plane is

$$\widetilde{W}_X = \sum_{i=1}^{N} e^{-s_i}, \tag{5.97}$$

which is the mirror condition found in [12] when studying the mirrors of A-branes without equivariant structure. However, turning to $\widetilde{W}_{equiv}$, we find that the boundary condition (5.88) implies that the image of the D0-brane in the $\widetilde{W}_{equiv}$-plane is $\widetilde{W}_{equiv} = 0$, and thus we require further analysis to identify the mirror of the $U(1)^k$-equivariant structure on the A-brane.

Now, for the D0-brane mirrors of ordinary A-branes, there is an additional requirement which is necessary to prevent spontaneous supersymmetry breaking, that is the D0-brane should be at a *critical point* of the twisted superpotential $\widetilde{W}_X = \sum_{j=1}^{N} e^{-s_j - \sum_{c=1}^{k} v_{cj}\Theta_c}$ [8, 12, 27, 28]. This condition is necessary for the potential energy of the mirror Landau-Ginzburg model (with twisted superpotential $\widetilde{W}_X$) to have a vanishing vacuum expectation value. We shall generalize this analysis to the *gauged* Landau-Ginzburg model with neutral matter (5.93) which we are presently concerned with. Here, the twisted superpotential terms can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2x \frac{1}{2}\Big(\int d^2\widetilde{\theta}\widetilde{W}(\Theta,\widetilde{\Sigma}) + c.c.\Big) \\
=&\frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2x \frac{1}{2}\Bigg(\sum_{c}^{k}\Big(E_c^{\theta}\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\theta_c} + (\widetilde{D}_c - i\widetilde{F}_{01c})\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\widetilde{\sigma}_c}\Big) + c.c. \\
&+\sum_{c}^{k}\sum_{d}^{k}\Big(\chi_{-c}^{\theta}\overline{\chi}_{+d}^{\theta}\frac{\partial^2\widetilde{W}}{\partial\theta_c\partial\theta_d} + \widetilde{\lambda}_{-c}\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{+d}\frac{\partial^2\widetilde{W}}{\partial\widetilde{\sigma}_c\partial\widetilde{\sigma}_d} + i\overline{\chi}_{+c}^{\theta}\widetilde{\lambda}_{-d}\frac{\partial^2\widetilde{W}}{\partial\theta_c\partial\widetilde{\sigma}_d} + i\chi_{-c}^{\theta}\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{+d}\frac{\partial^2\widetilde{W}}{\partial\theta_c\partial\widetilde{\sigma}_d}\Big) + c.c.\Bigg),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.98}$$

[60] In the case where the two boundaries of the strip are mapped to different equivariant A-branes, labelled by $s_j^{(1)}$ and $s_j^{(2)}$, the positions of the mirror D0-branes are determined by $\sum_{c=1}^{k} v_{cj}\theta_c = s_j^{(1)} - \hat{s}_j$ and $\sum_{c=1}^{k} v_{cj}\theta_c = s_j^{(2)} - \hat{s}_j$ respectively.

where $\widetilde{W}$ is given by (3.11). Taking into account the presence of the auxiliary field terms

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2x(\sum_c^k\sum_d^k g_{cd}E_c^\theta\overline{E}_d^\theta+\sum_c^k\frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2}\widetilde{D}_c\widetilde{D}_c) \tag{5.99}$$

in the action (where g_{cd} is the flat Kähler metric of $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^k$), upon integrating out the auxiliary fields $\widetilde{D}_c$, and E_c, the potential energy becomes

$$V=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int dx^1\left(\frac{1}{4}g^{cd}\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\theta_c}\frac{\partial\overline{\widetilde{W}}}{\partial\overline{\theta}_d}+\frac{1}{2}\sum_c^k\widetilde{e}_c^2\mathrm{Re}\Big(\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\widetilde{\sigma}_c}\Big)\mathrm{Re}\Big(\frac{\partial\overline{\widetilde{W}}}{\partial\overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c}\Big)\right). \tag{5.100}$$

Since the value of the twisted superpotential is fixed at the boundaries, the form of the potential energy indicates the occurrence of spontaneous supersymmetry breaking,[61] unless the twisted superpotential obeys the condition

$$\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\theta_c}=0, \tag{5.101}$$

i.e., the D0-brane is at a critical point of the superpotential with respect to $\widetilde{\theta}_c$, as well as the condition

$$\mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\widetilde{\sigma}_c}\right)=0. \tag{5.102}$$

The condition (5.101) is given explicitly as

$$\sum_j^N\langle\widetilde{\sigma},\widetilde{Q}_j\rangle v_c^j-\sum_j^N v_c^j e^{-\langle v^j,\theta\rangle-\hat{s}^j}=0, \tag{5.103}$$

or

$$\sum_j^N\langle\widetilde{\sigma},\widetilde{Q}_j\rangle v_c^j=\sum_j^N v_c^j e^{-s^j}, \tag{5.104}$$

while the condition (5.102) is given by

$$\mathrm{Re}(\widetilde{Q}_{jc}s^j-\widetilde{t}_c)=0 \tag{5.105}$$

The constraint (5.104) is a generalization of the critical point condition found by Hori for non-equivariant case, and the constraint (5.105) does not occur for the non-equivariant case. Hence, these conditions should be interpreted as the mirror of the $U(1)^k$-equivariant structure of the equivariant A-brane on $\mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$. In particular, (5.105) is the real part of the condition $\widetilde{Q}_{jc}s^j-\widetilde{t}_c=0$, which is implied by $\mathcal{Q}_{ja}s^j-t_a=0$. The latter holds since it was necessary for the A-type supersymmetry and gauge symmetry of the

[61] This is because it is impossible to achieve $\langle V\rangle=0$ otherwise. In the bulk, the fields are dynamical functions, and therefore the minimum of the potential energy is zero due to its quadratic form. However at the boundary, a minimum of zero cannot be achieved (since the value of the superpotential is fixed at the boundary), unless appropriate conditions are satisfied.

$U(1)^{N-k} \times U(1)^k$ GLSM (see (5.53)). In fact, the new condition $\widetilde{Q}_{jc}s^j - \widetilde{t}_c = 0$ constrains the position of the D0-brane (defined by s^j via (5.95)).

In this section, we have restricted ourselves to equivariant A-branes whose mirrors are D0-branes. However, there are A-branes whose mirrors are higher-dimensional branes holomorphically embedded in the mirror target space. In Hori's construction [12], these can be studied by promoting the parameter s_i to a superfield S_i. It would be interesting to study equivariant structure on these branes.

5.5 Nonabelian Equivariant A-branes

We may use the insights obtained from analyzing the equivariant A-branes for abelian groups which we have found thus far to infer the description of equivariant A-branes for general nonabelian groups. We shall use the GNLSM notation of Section 2 in this subsection. The equivariant A-brane shall be a submanifold (denoted as γ) of X, to which a boundary of the worldsheet is mapped via $(\phi^i, \overline{\phi}^{\overline{i}})$.

Firstly, we note that the boundary action (5.70) for $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ is an example of the GNLSM generalization of the NLSM boundary Wilson line (5.4). Hence, for general GNLSMs the boundary action ought to be

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\partial\Sigma} &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left(A_i^X \partial_0^A \phi^i + A_{\overline{i}}^X \partial_0^A \overline{\phi}^{\overline{i}} \right) \\ &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \left(A_i^X \partial_0 \phi^i + A_{\overline{i}}^X \partial_0 \overline{\phi}^{\overline{i}} - \widetilde{R}_a A_0^a \right) \end{aligned} \tag{5.106}$$

where A^X is the G-invariant ($\mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{e}} A^X = 0$) connection and $\widetilde{R}_a = -\iota_{\widetilde{e}_a} A^X$ is the moment of a flat, G-equivariant $U(1)$ bundle. Gauge invariance of this boundary action follows from the equivariant Bianchi identity

$$d\widetilde{R} = \iota_{\widetilde{e}} F^X, \tag{5.107}$$

and this implies that γ supports a flat, G-equivariant $U(1)$ bundle. Its supersymmetry variation is

$$\delta S_{\partial_\Sigma} = -\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \widetilde{R}_a \left(\frac{i}{2} (\epsilon(\overline{\lambda}_+^a + \lambda_-^a) + \overline{\epsilon}(\lambda_+^a + \overline{\lambda}_-^a)) \right). \tag{5.108}$$

Just like in the $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ case, we require that this cancels the C-term in (2.35) and the θ_a-term in (2.34), i.e., we require that

$$2\pi \widetilde{R}_a = -\theta_a + \phi^* C_a, \tag{5.109}$$

on γ. The remaining terms in (2.34) then vanish using the gauge invariant boundary

conditions

$$\begin{aligned} A_{1a} &= 0, \\ \partial_1 A_{0a} &= 0, \\ \lambda_{+a} - \overline{\lambda}_{-a} &= 0, \\ \partial_1(\lambda_{-a} + \overline{\lambda}_{+a}) &= 0, \\ \partial_1 \sigma_a &= 0, \\ \mu_a &= -r_a. \end{aligned} \tag{5.110}$$

Note that these conditions are a direct generalization of the conditions given for the example of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, except that $F_{01a} = 0$ is replaced by the stricter conditions $A_{1a} = 0$ and $\partial_1 A_{0a} = 0$. This is necessary since the field strength F_{01a} now contains a nonabelian term, and this causes A-type supersymmetry invariance of the set of boundary conditions to not hold unless we use the stricter conditions. The boundary conditions on the gauge fields in fact imply that gauge transformations have to be restricted such that the transformation parameter α^a has vanishing derivative with respect to x^1 at the boundary. Just like in the example of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, these boundary conditions (together with the constraint (5.109)) also preserve the locality of the equations of motion for vector multiplet components. Now, the only terms left to consider in (2.35) are the B-field terms. These vanish by requiring that the restriction of the B-field on X to the submanifold γ vanishes.

Next, we turn to the boundary conditions for the matter fields. We first recall that for $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, the equivariant A-brane corresponded to a Lagrangian torus T^{N-1}, which was invariant under the $U(1)^{N-1}$ isometry of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$. Let us next consider the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ subalgebra of A-type supersymmetry, which corresponds to $\epsilon_+ = i\epsilon$, $\overline{\epsilon}_+ = -i\epsilon$, $\epsilon_- = -i\epsilon$ and $\overline{\epsilon}_- = i\epsilon$. In this case, after integrating out the auxiliary fields F^i and $\overline{F^i}$, we find that (2.33) is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S_{matter} = -\frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{i\epsilon}{2}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0 \{ & g_{IJ}\partial_0^A\phi^I(\psi_-^J - \psi_+^J) + g_{IJ}\partial_1^A\phi^I(\psi_-^J + \psi_+^J) \\ & + g_{IJ}(\psi_+^I - \psi_-^I)\mathrm{Re}(\sigma^a)\widetilde{e}_a^J + \omega_{IJ}(\psi_+^I + \psi_-^I)\mathrm{Im}(\sigma^a)\widetilde{e}_a^J\}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.111}$$

where $g_{IJ}X^IY^J = g_{i\overline{j}}(X^iY^{\overline{j}} + Y^iX^{\overline{j}})$ and $\omega_{IJ}X^IY^J = ig_{i\overline{j}}(X^iY^{\overline{j}} - Y^iX^{\overline{j}})$ are respectively the metric and Kähler form on X. Now, any allowed variation of ϕ (denoted $\delta\phi^I$ for the real coordinate ϕ^I) along the boundary, and the covariant derivative along the boundary, $\partial_0^A\phi^I$, ought to be tangent to γ. If we insist on locality of the matter equations of motion (like in the $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ case), we require that

$$\begin{aligned} g_{IJ}\delta\phi^I\partial_1^A\phi^J &= 0 \\ g_{IJ}(\psi_-^I\delta\psi_-^J - \psi_+^I\delta\psi_+^J) &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{5.112}$$

at the boundaries, where we have used the fact that the B-field vanishes at the boundaries. The first constraint of (5.112) then implies that $\partial_1^A\phi^J$ is normal to γ. Hence we find that (5.111) vanishes if and only if $i\epsilon(\psi_-^I - \psi_+^I)$ and $i\epsilon(\psi_-^I + \psi_+^I)$ are respectively normal and tangent to γ, $\widetilde{e}_a^I$ is tangent to γ, and the Kähler form vanishes against tangent vectors of γ. These last two conditions respectively imply that γ is G-invariant, and that it is

an isotropic submanifold of X. In addition, we note that $i\epsilon(\psi_-^I - \psi_+^I)$ being normal to γ implies that $\psi_-^I - \psi_+^I = 0$ along γ and along the worldsheet boundary, which satisfies the second constraint of (5.112).

Next, under A-type supersymmetry, ϕ^i transforms as

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\phi^i =&\epsilon_+\psi_-^i - \overline{\epsilon}_+\psi_+^i\\ =&\epsilon_1(\psi_-^i - \psi_+^i) + i\epsilon_2(\psi_-^i + \psi_+^i),\end{aligned} \tag{5.113}$$

where $\epsilon_+ = \epsilon_1 + i\epsilon_2$. Hence, $\epsilon(\psi_-^i - \psi_+^i)$ and $i\epsilon(\psi_-^i + \psi_+^i)$ are holomorphic components of vectors which are tangent to γ, where ϵ is a real parameter. However, from the previous paragraph, we know that $i\epsilon(\psi_-^i - \psi_+^i)$ is the holomorphic component of a vector which is normal to γ. This implies that multiplication by i converts tangent vectors of γ into normal vectors of γ, and vice versa. Thus, γ is a middle-dimensional Lagrangian submanifold of X. This Lagrangian submanifold also happens to be G-invariant, which we know from the previous paragraph.

Indeed, (2.33) vanishes under this boundary condition. Integrating out the auxiliary fields F^i and $\overline{F}^{\overline{i}}$, (2.33) can be rewritten (for $\epsilon_+ = \overline{\epsilon}_-$) as

$$\begin{aligned}\delta S_{matter} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{1}{4}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dx^0\Big\{\epsilon\Big(&- g(\partial_0^A\phi, \psi_- - \psi_+) - i\omega(\partial_0^A\phi, \psi_- + \psi_+)\\ &- g(\partial_1^A\phi, \psi_- + \psi_+) - i\omega(\partial_1^A\phi, \psi_- - \psi_+)\\ &- \mathrm{Re}(\sigma^a)g(\widetilde{e}_a, \psi_+ - \psi_-) - i\mathrm{Re}(\sigma^a)\omega(\widetilde{e}_a, \psi_+ + \psi_-)\\ &- i\mathrm{Im}(\sigma^a)g(\widetilde{e}_a, \psi_+ - \psi_-) + \mathrm{Im}(\sigma^a)\omega(\widetilde{e}_a, \psi_+ + \psi_-)\Big) + c.c.\Big\},\end{aligned} \tag{5.114}$$

(where $g(X,Y) = g_{IJ}X^IY^J$ and $\omega(X,Y) = \omega_{IJ}X^IY^J$), which vanishes using the facts that $\partial_0^A\phi^I$, $\psi_-^I + \psi_+^I$ and $\widetilde{e}_a^I$ are tangent to γ while $\partial_1^A\phi^I$ and $\psi_-^I - \psi_+^I$ are normal to γ.[62]

In conclusion, we find that in general, equivariant A-branes ought to be G-invariant Lagrangian submanifolds of X, which support G-equivariant flat $U(1)$ bundles, and on which the B-field vanishes. This implies that they are the simplest objects in the G-equivariant Fukaya category of X, by generalizing the definition of the equivariant Fukaya category for finite groups ([26], page 69) to any compact Lie group G. As mentioned in Section 5.2, Kapustin et al. ([15], page 58) have conjectured that the category of G-equivariant A-branes is some sort of G-equivariant version of the Fukaya category. Hence, we have further verified their conjecture for nonabelian G. Fully proving their conjecture would require constructing the other objects in the category, which correspond to Lagrangian submanifolds that support equivariant flat unitary vector bundles, and these should correspond to the insertion of certain G-invariant Wilson lines in the path integral.

6 Open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten Invariants

In this section, we shall use equivariant A-branes to define open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants. We shall first study the nonabelian open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten

[62] Recall that for a tangent vector, T, and normal vector, N, of a Lagrangian submanifold, γ, of the Kähler manifold X, we have $\omega(T,T) = \omega(N,N) = 0$ on γ.

invariants via the open topological gauged A-model, using the boundary conditions and boundary term we have found in Section 5.5. In the final two subsections, we shall focus on investigating the abelian open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants via mirror symmetry.

6.1 Open Topological Gauged A-model

The closed topological gauged A-model was introduced by Baptista [3], and in the following we shall generalize it to the case with boundaries, i.e., the *open* topological gauged A-model. This involves analytically continuing the Minkowski strip to the Euclidean one, subsequently twisting the fields in the action (2.4) + (2.19) as well as its supercharges using their vector R-charges, and imposing the appropriate boundary conditions (found in Section 5.5) which are supersymmetric with respect to the scalar supercharge $Q_A = Q_- + \overline{Q}_+$. We also include the gauge invariant boundary term (5.106) on each boundary.

The twisted fields are redefined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi^k &= \sqrt{2}\psi_-^k & \psi_z^a &= (-i\lambda_-^a)/\sqrt{2} \\
\overline{\chi}^{\overline{k}} &= \sqrt{2}\overline{\psi}_+^{\overline{k}} & \psi_{\bar{z}}^a &= (i\overline{\lambda}_+^a)/\sqrt{2} \\
\varphi^a &= -i2\sigma^a & \rho_{\bar{z}}^k &= \sqrt{2}\psi_+^k \\
\xi^a &= \overline{\sigma}^a/4 & \overline{\rho}_z^{\overline{k}} &= \sqrt{2}\overline{\psi}_-^{\overline{k}} \\
\eta^a &= -i(\overline{\lambda}_-^a + \lambda_+^a)/(2\sqrt{2}) & \kappa^a &= i(\overline{\lambda}_-^a - \lambda_+^a)/\sqrt{2} \\
\mathcal{H}_{\bar{z}}^k &= 4id_{\bar{z}}^A\phi^k + 2(F^k - \Gamma_{ij}^k\psi_+^i\psi_-^j) & \mathcal{C}^a &= 2(F_A)_{12}^a + 2D^a \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

where the fields are now sections of the following bundles

$$\chi \in \Omega_-^0(\Sigma; \phi^* \ker d\pi_E) \qquad \varphi, \xi, \mathcal{C} \in \Omega_+^0(\Sigma; \mathfrak{g}_P) \tag{6.2}$$

$$\rho \in \Omega_-^{0,1}(\Sigma; \phi^* \ker d\pi_E) \qquad \eta, \kappa \in \Omega_-^0(\Sigma; \mathfrak{g}_P) \tag{6.3}$$

$$\mathcal{H} \in \Omega_+^{0,1}(\Sigma; \phi^* \ker d\pi_E) \qquad \psi \in \Omega_-^1(\Sigma; \mathfrak{g}_P) \ , \tag{6.4}$$

with the remaining 'barred' fields being interpreted as the local complex conjugates of the

ones above. The action of the open gauged A-model is then

$$\begin{aligned}
S_A = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma \Big\{ & \frac{1}{2e^2}|F_A|^2 + |d^A\phi|^2 + \frac{1}{2}e^2|\mu\circ\phi + r|^2 + \frac{i}{e^2}(\nabla^A\varphi, \nabla^A\xi) + \frac{1}{2e^2}|[\varphi,\xi]|^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{2e^2}[\varphi,\eta]_a\eta^a + \frac{1}{8e^2}[\varphi,\kappa]_a\kappa^a - \frac{1}{2e^2}|\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{C} - *F_A - e^2\,(\mu\circ\phi + r)|^2 \\
& - \frac{1}{8}|\mathcal{H} - 4i\overline{\partial}^A\phi|^2 + ig_{j\overline{k}}(\varphi^a\xi^b + \varphi^b\xi^a)\widetilde{e}_a^j\,\overline{\widetilde{e}}_b^{\overline{k}} + 2ig_{j\overline{k}}(\nabla_l\widetilde{e}_a^j)\xi^a\chi^l\overline{\chi}^{\overline{k}} \\
& + ig_{j\overline{k}}(\eta^a + \frac{1}{2}\kappa^a)\,\overline{\widetilde{e}}_a^{\overline{k}}\,\chi^j + ig_{j\overline{k}}(\eta^a - \frac{1}{2}\kappa^a)\,\widetilde{e}_a^j\,\overline{\chi}^{\overline{k}}\Big\}\ \mathrm{vol}_\Sigma \\
+\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma \Big\{ & \frac{i}{2e^2}\eta_a \overleftrightarrow{\nabla}^A * \psi^a - \frac{1}{4e^2}\kappa_a \overleftrightarrow{\nabla}^A\psi^a + \frac{i}{8}R_{i\overline{j}k\overline{m}}(\rho^i\wedge\overline{\rho}^{\overline{j}})\chi^k\overline{\chi}^{\overline{m}} \\
& - \frac{i}{e^2}\xi_a[\psi, *\psi]^a + \frac{1}{4}g_{j\overline{k}}\,\rho^j\wedge(\phi^*\overleftrightarrow{\nabla}^A)\overline{\chi}^{\overline{k}} + \frac{1}{4}g_{j\overline{k}}\,\overline{\rho}^{\overline{k}}\wedge(\phi^*\overleftrightarrow{\nabla}^A)\chi^j \\
& + \frac{i}{8}g_{j\overline{k}}\varphi^a(\nabla_l\widetilde{e}^j)\rho^l\wedge\overline{\rho}^{\overline{k}} + \frac{1}{2}g_{j\overline{k}}\,\widetilde{e}_a^j\,\psi^a\wedge\overline{\rho}^{\overline{k}} + \frac{1}{2}g_{j\overline{k}}\,\overline{\widetilde{e}}_a^{\overline{k}}\,\psi^a\wedge\rho^j\Big\} \\
+\frac{1}{2\pi}i\Big(\int_\Sigma \phi^*B\ - & \int_{\partial\Sigma}\phi^*C_aA^a\Big) + \frac{1}{2\pi}i\int_\Sigma(\theta, F_A) - i\int_{\partial\Sigma}A_I^X d^A\phi^I,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

where F_A is the curvature two-form of the connection $A = A_\mu dx^\mu$, and the measure on the worldsheet is $\mathrm{vol}_\Sigma = dx\wedge d\tau = \frac{i}{2}dz\wedge d\bar{z}$.[63] The fields $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are auxiliary fields, which can be integrated out of the action using their equations of motion

$$\mathcal{C}^a = 2 * F_A^a + 2e^2\,(\mu^a\circ\phi + r^a) \tag{6.6}$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{\bar{z}}^k = 4id_{\bar{z}}^A\phi^k\ . \tag{6.7}$$

The supersymmetry transformations generated by the scalar supercharge $Q_A = Q_- + \overline{Q}_+$ on the new fields follow from the supersymmetry transformations (2.30) and (2.31), with $\epsilon_+ = \bar{\epsilon}_- = \sqrt{2}$ and $\epsilon_- = \bar{\epsilon}_+ = 0$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_A\,\phi^k &= \chi^k & Q_A\,A &= \psi \\
Q_A\,\chi^k &= \varphi^a\widetilde{e}_a^k & Q_A\,\psi &= -\nabla^A\varphi \\
Q_A\,\xi &= \eta & Q_A\,\kappa &= \mathcal{C} \\
Q_A\,\eta &= [\varphi,\xi] & Q_A\,\mathcal{C} &= [\varphi,\kappa] \\
Q_A\,\rho^k &= \mathcal{H}^k - \Gamma_{ij}^k\chi^i\rho^j & Q_A\,\varphi &= 0 \\
Q_A\,\mathcal{H}^k &= R_{i\overline{j}l\overline{m}}g^{k\overline{j}}\chi^l\overline{\chi}^{\overline{m}}\rho^i - \Gamma_{jl}^k\mathcal{H}^j\chi^l + \varphi^a(\nabla_j\widetilde{e}_a^k)\rho^j\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

The action (6.5) is in fact Q_A-exact up to topological terms,

$$S_A\ =\ Q_A\Psi\ +\ \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma\phi^*([\eta_\omega] + i[\eta_B]) +\ \frac{1}{2\pi}i\int_\Sigma(\theta, F_A) - i\ \int_{\partial\Sigma}A_I^X d^A\phi^I \tag{6.9}$$

[63] We recall at this point that when $G = G_1\times G_2\times G_3\ldots$, each factor G_i has its own coupling constant, e_i. In the $G = U(1)^k$ case that we have focused on in the previous section, each $U(1)$ factor had its own coupling constant, previously denoted $\widetilde{e}_c$.

with gauge fermion

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi \;=\; & \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma\Big\{\frac{1}{2e^2}\,\kappa_a(*F_A+e^2(\mu\circ\phi+r))^a+\frac{1}{8e^2}\,\kappa_a\mathcal{C}^a+\frac{1}{2e^2}\,\eta_a[\varphi,\xi]^a+ig_{j\overline{k}}\,\xi^a(\widetilde{e}_a^j\,\overline{\chi}^{\overline{k}}+\overline{\widetilde{e}}_a^{\overline{k}}\,\chi^j)\Big\}\mathrm{vol}_\Sigma\\ & +\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma\Big\{\frac{i}{e^2}\,\xi_a(\nabla^A*\psi^a)-\frac{i}{16}\,g_{j\overline{k}}\,\overline{\rho}^{\overline{k}}\wedge(\mathcal{H}-8i\overline{\partial}^A\phi)^j+\frac{i}{16}\,g_{j\overline{k}}\,\rho^j\wedge\overline{(\mathcal{H}-8i\overline{\partial}^A\phi)^k}\Big\}\;,\end{aligned}$$

where we have performed integration by parts in some of the kinetic terms in (6.5). The resulting boundary terms vanish using the boundary conditions given in Section 5.5. For the case of $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ which we studied extensively in the previous section, the boundary conditions are (5.63) and (5.57), appropriately twisted. In particular, the boundary conditions $\partial_1\varphi_a=0$, $\kappa_a=0$, $\psi_z^a+\psi_{\bar z}^a=0$, $\overline{Z}^i\chi^i+Z^i\overline{\chi}^i=0$ and $\overline{Z}^i\rho_{\bar z}^i+Z^i\overline{\rho}_z^i=0$ are used to remove the boundary terms that appear when integrating by parts.

Let us elucidate the first topological term of (6.9). Here, $[\eta_\omega]$ and $[\eta_B]$ represent equivariant cohomology classes in $H^2_G(X)$. Their pullbacks are the cohomology classes in $H^2(E)$ represented by the two-forms

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_\omega(A)&=\omega-d((\mu_a+r_a)A^a)\qquad\in\Omega^2(P\times X)\;,\\ \eta_B(A)&=B-d(C_aA^a)\qquad\in\Omega^2(P\times X)\;,\end{aligned}\tag{6.10}$$

both of which descend to $E=P\times_G X$. In particular, this term is topological since $\int_\Sigma\phi^*[\eta_\omega]$ and $\int_\Sigma\phi^*[\eta_B]$ do not change under deformations of the map ϕ, since the pull-back map is always homotopy invariant [3].

The open gauged A-model is topological as a *quantum* theory,[64] and in order to consistently quantize such a gauge theory, one ought to perform BRST gauge-fixing, which involves the inclusion of Fadeev-Popov ghost fields in the action. This can be done straightforwardly, and we shall not write down the gauge-fixing action, S_{BRST}, explicitly. However, the open gauged A-model is anomalous, and in Section 6.4, we shall compute this anomaly by canonically quantizing the gauged Landau-Ginzburg mirror of the *abelian* open gauged A-model. Notably, in the process we shall describe S_{BRST} for abelian gauge groups in detail.

6.2 Observables and Open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten Invariants

A canonical set of bulk observables of the closed gauged A-model were described in [3], with the path integrals over these observables eventually argued to be equal to the Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants. In this section, we shall recall the description of these bulk observables, as well as introduce *boundary* observables which are defined with respect to the topology of the equivariant A-branes.

In the ordinary open A-model, one can construct bulk observables from the de Rham cohomology classes of the target X, as well as construct boundary observables from the de Rham cohomology classes of the A-branes, which are the subspaces of X (i.e., Lagrangian submanifolds) to which boundaries of the worldsheet are mapped. For the open gauged A-model, one uses the G-equivariant cohomology classes of X to define bulk operators, as well

[64] In particular, the correlation functions of the theory are invariant under diffeomorphisms of the worldsheet, e.g., transforming it from a strip to a disk.

as the G-equivariant cohomology classes of the equivariant A-branes to define boundary operators.

The G-equivariant cohomology classes of a manifold, M, are defined using the G-equivariant complex $\Omega^\bullet_G(M)$, which is the set of G-invariant elements in the tensor product $S^\bullet(\mathfrak{g}^*) \otimes \Omega^\bullet(M)$, with $S^\bullet(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ being the symmetric algebra of the dual of $\mathfrak{g}$.

For $M = X$, an equivariant form, α, can be written on a local patch of X as

$$\alpha \;=\; \alpha_{a_1\cdots a_r k_1\cdots k_p \overline{l_1}\cdots\overline{l_q}}(w)\; \zeta^{a_1}\cdots\zeta^{a_r}\; dw^{k_1}\wedge\cdots\wedge dw^{k_p}\wedge d\overline{w}^{\overline{l_1}}\wedge\cdots\wedge d\overline{w}^{\overline{l_q}}\;, \tag{6.11}$$

where w are the coordinates on the patch. The coefficients $\alpha_{a_1\cdots a_r k_1\cdots k_p \overline{l_1}\cdots\overline{l_q}}$ are symmetric with respect to the indices a_i, and antisymmetric with respect to the indices k_i and l_i. Such a local form can be associated with a bulk operator $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$ in the open gauged A-model [3],

$$\mathcal{O}_\alpha \;=\; (\alpha_{a_1\cdots a_r k_1\cdots k_p \overline{l_1}\cdots\overline{l_q}}\circ\phi)\left[\prod_{j=1}^{r}(\varphi+\psi-F_A)^{a_j}\right]\left[\prod_{i=1}^{p}(\chi^{k_i}-d^A\phi^{k_i})\right]\left[\prod_{i=1}^{q}(\overline{\chi}^{\overline{l_i}}-d^A\overline{\phi}^{\overline{l_i}})\right]. \tag{6.12}$$

This correspondence holds globally on X. Moreover, we have

$$(d_\Sigma + Q_A)\,\mathcal{O}_\alpha = \mathcal{O}_{d_G\alpha}\;, \tag{6.13}$$

where d_Σ is the exterior derivative on the open worldsheet, Σ, while $d_G = 1\otimes d + e^a\otimes\iota_{\widetilde{e}_a}$ is the Cartan operator defined on $\Omega^\bullet_G(X)$. $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$ can be decomposed with respect to the form degree on the worldsheet,

$$\mathcal{O}_\alpha \;=\; \mathcal{O}^{(0)}_\alpha \;+\; \mathcal{O}^{(1)}_\alpha \;+\; \mathcal{O}^{(2)}_\alpha\;,$$

where, in particular,

$$\mathcal{O}^{(0)}_\alpha \;=\; (\alpha_{a_1\cdots a_r k_1\cdots k_p \overline{l_1}\cdots\overline{l_q}}\circ\phi)\left(\prod_{j=1}^{r}\varphi^{a_j}\right)\left(\prod_{i=1}^{p}\chi^{k_i}\right)\left(\prod_{i=1}^{q}\overline{\chi}^{\overline{l_i}}\right)\;, \tag{6.14}$$

is a local operator.

If we assume that $d_G\alpha = 0$, then (6.13) splits into the descent equations

$$d_\Sigma\,\mathcal{O}^{(2)}_\alpha \;=\; 0 \tag{6.15}$$

$$d_\Sigma\,\mathcal{O}^{(1)}_\alpha \;=\; -\,Q_A\,\mathcal{O}^{(2)}_\alpha \tag{6.16}$$

$$d_\Sigma\,\mathcal{O}^{(0)}_\alpha \;=\; -\,Q_A\,\mathcal{O}^{(1)}_\alpha \tag{6.17}$$

$$Q_A\,\mathcal{O}^{(0)}_\alpha \;=\; 0 \tag{6.18}$$

For a closed worlsheet, Σ, if β is j-dimensional homology cycle in Σ, one could define the Q_A-invariant operators

$$W(\alpha,\beta) \;:=\; \int_\beta \mathcal{O}^{(j)}_\alpha\;.$$

However, there are no 2-cycles on an open worldsheet. Hence, $\mathcal{O}^{(2)}_\alpha$ ought to be integrated over the entire open worldsheet, and it is necessary for Q_A-invariance of $\mathcal{O}^{(2)}_\alpha$ that $\mathcal{O}^{(1)}_\alpha = 0$ at the boundaries.

For $M = L$, where L is an equivariant A-brane, an equivariant form, ζ, can be written on a local patch of L as

$$\zeta \;=\; \zeta_{a_1\cdots a_r m_1\cdots m_s}(u)\;\zeta^{a_1}\cdots\zeta^{a_r}\;du^{m_1}\wedge\cdots\wedge du^{m_s}\;, \tag{6.19}$$

where u are the coordinates on the patch. The coefficients $\zeta_{a_1\cdots a_r m_1\cdots m_s}$ are symmetric with respect to the indices a_i, and antisymmetric with respect to the indices m_i. Such a local form can be associated with a boundary operator $O_\zeta|_{\partial\Sigma}$ in the open gauged A-model,

$$\mathcal{O}_\zeta|_{\partial\Sigma} \;=\; (\zeta_{a_1\cdots a_r m_1\cdots m_s}\circ\gamma)\left[\prod_{j=1}^{r}(\varphi+\psi|_{\partial\Sigma})^{a_j}\right]\left[\prod_{i=1}^{s}((Q_A\gamma)^{m_i}-d^A\gamma^{m_i})\right]\;, \tag{6.20}$$

where γ is a section $\gamma:\partial\Sigma\to E_L$ of the associated bundle $E_L = P_{\partial\Sigma}\times_G L$ (here $P_{\partial\Sigma}$ is the principal G-bundle over $\partial\Sigma$), and where $\psi|_{\partial\Sigma}$ is the restriction of ψ to the boundary in question. In particular, we have

$$(d_{\partial\Sigma}+Q_A)\;\mathcal{O}_\zeta = \mathcal{O}_{d_G\zeta}\;, \tag{6.21}$$

where $d_{\partial\Sigma}$ is the exterior derivative on the worldsheet boundary $\partial\Sigma$, while d_G is the Cartan operator defined on $\Omega^\bullet_G(L)$. Just like bulk operators, $\mathcal{O}_\zeta$ can be decomposed with respect to the form degree on the worldsheet boundary,

$$\mathcal{O}_\zeta \;=\; \mathcal{O}^{(0)}_\zeta \;+\; \mathcal{O}^{(1)}_\zeta,$$

If it is assumed that $d_G\zeta = 0$, then (6.21) splits into the descent equations

$$d_{\partial\Sigma}\;\mathcal{O}^{(1)}_\zeta \;=0 \tag{6.22}$$

$$d_{\partial\Sigma}\;\mathcal{O}^{(0)}_\zeta \;=\; -\,Q_A\;\mathcal{O}^{(1)}_\zeta \tag{6.23}$$

$$Q_A\;\mathcal{O}^{(0)}_\zeta \;=\; 0, \tag{6.24}$$

where, for example,

$$\mathcal{O}^{(0)}_\zeta \;=\; (\zeta_{a_1\cdots a_r m_1\cdots m_s}\circ\gamma)\left(\prod_{j=1}^{r}\varphi^{a_j}\right)\left(\prod_{i=1}^{s}(Q_A\gamma)^{m_i}\right)\;. \tag{6.25}$$

Thus, if ν is j-dimensional homology cycle in $\partial\Sigma$, one can then define the Q_A-invariant operators

$$W_{\partial\Sigma}(\zeta,\nu)\;:=\;\int_\nu\;\mathcal{O}^{(j)}_\zeta\;. \tag{6.26}$$

The most general correlation function based on the above bulk and boundary operators can then be written down as the following path integral

$$\int\mathcal{D}(A,\phi,\varphi,\xi,\rho,\eta,\kappa,\psi,\chi,b,c)\;\;e^{-(S_A+S_{BRST})}\;\prod_i W(\alpha_i,\gamma_i)\prod_j W_{\partial\Sigma}(\zeta_j,\nu_j)\;, \tag{6.27}$$

where b and c are ghost fields which appear in S_{BRST}. Here, the path integration is taken such that ϕ is restricted to a fixed topological sector, i.e., $\phi_*[\Sigma] \in H_2^G(X)$ and $\phi_*[\partial\Sigma] \in H_1^G(L)$.

Before ending this subsection, we shall return to the example of $X = \mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, where any equivariant A-brane wraps a Lagrangian submanifold T^{N-1}. Here, we note that

$$Q_A \gamma^i = Q_A \frac{(\log Z^i - \log \overline{Z}^i)}{2i} = \frac{1}{2i}\Big(\frac{\chi^i}{Z^i} - \frac{\overline{\chi}^i}{\overline{Z}^i}\Big) = \frac{1}{2i|Z^i|^2}\Big(\chi^i \overline{Z}^i - \overline{\chi}^i Z^i\Big) \tag{6.28}$$

is well-defined (since $|Z^i|^2 = c_i/c_N$ at the boundary), and is nonzero since the only fermionic Dirichlet boundary condition involving χ^i and $\overline{\chi}^i$ is $(\overline{Z}^i \chi^i + Z^i \overline{\chi}^i) = 0$ (c.f. (5.63)). In addition, the boundary conditions (5.63) imply that $d^A \gamma^i$ is nonzero at the boundary. Moreover, the boundary condition $(\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{+c} - \widetilde{\lambda}_{+c}) = 0$ translates to $(\psi_{zc} + \psi_{\bar{z}c}) = \psi_{1c} = 0$, and $\psi_c|_{\partial\Sigma} = i(\psi_{zc} - \psi_{\bar{z}c})dx^2 = \psi_{2c}dx^2$ is nonzero and well-defined. Finally, the boundary condition for φ_c is $\partial_1 \varphi_c$ (which comes from $\partial_1 \widetilde{\sigma}_c = 0$), and thus, φ_c is nonzero at the boundary. Hence, boundary operators of the form (6.20) are nonzero and well-defined, and those which belong to the Q_A-cohomology can be identified with elements of $H^\bullet_{U(1)^{N-1}}(T^{N-1})$.

Any supersymmetric path integral localizes to the bosonic field configurations that are fixed points of the supersymmetry [8]. For the open gauged A-model, these field configurations can be read from the Q_A variations of the fermionic fields in (6.8), after integrating out the auxiliary fields. They correspond to the solutions of

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{\partial}^A \phi = 0 \\ &*F_A + e^2(\mu \circ \phi + r) = 0 \\ &\nabla^A \varphi = \varphi^a (\widetilde{e}_a \circ \phi) = 0 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.29}$$

The first two equations are known as the symplectic vortex equations on an infinite strip, and were introduced by Cieliebak et al. in [29], and are a generalization of the typical Nielsen-Olsen vortex equations on a strip. In what follows, we shall refer to them as the open symplectic vortex equations. The last two equations are non-trivial, but in most interesting cases that we will consider have the trivial solution $\varphi = 0$ [3], and therefore we can ignore them in these cases. For the first equation of (6.29), the boundary condition used by Cieliebak et al. on the strip was that each boundary component of the strip was mapped to a G-invariant Lagrangian submanifold of X, and this is precisely the boundary condition we found in Section 5.5. In addition, for the second equation, we have found the boundary conditions $A_{1a} = 0$, $\partial_1 A_{0a}$ and $\mu_a = -r_a$. In particular, the condition that $\mu_a = -r_a$ on a G-invariant Lagrangian submanifold was predicted by Lemma 4.1 of [29].For the example of $X = \mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$, the open symplectic vortex equations read

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial^A_{\bar{z}} Z^i = 0 \\ &*\widetilde{F}_{Ac} + \widetilde{e}_c^2(\widetilde{\mu}_c \circ Z + \widetilde{r}_c) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.30}$$

Recall that the boundary conditions in this case are $*\widetilde{F}_{Ac} = 0$, $\widetilde{\mu}_c = -\widetilde{r}_c$ and Lagrangian boundary conditions for Z^i which map each boundary to a $U(1)^{N-1}$-invariant Lagrangian torus with topology T^{N-1}.

The localization of supersymmetric path integrals of the form (6.27) thus reduce them to ordinary integrals of differential forms over the moduli spaces of open symplectic vortices, which are the spaces of solutions to the open symplectic vortex equations up to gauge equivalence. As we shall show below, these moduli spaces are finite-dimensional, though they may be noncompact and contain singularities. The (infinite-dimensional) path integrals thus reduce to finite-dimensional integrals, which are well-defined mathematically (modulo issues related to the aforementioned noncompactness and singularities of the moduli spaces). These finite-dimensional integrals give us numbers which can be identified with the open version of the Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants of X in [29–31].

We note that in the limit where $e^2 \to +\infty$, a dynamically gauged sigma model with target X flows to an ordinary sigma model with target $X//G$ [3]. Hence, in analogy with the closed case [32], it is predicted that there is a relationship between the open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants of X and the open Gromov-Witten invariants of $X//G$.

6.3 Dimension of Moduli Space of Open Symplectic Vortices and R-anomaly

The axial R-anomaly has been previously used to compute the dimension of moduli spaces of holomorphic maps from an open Riemann surface to a Kähler manifold whereby the boundaries are mapped to Lagrangian submanifolds [8]. One can also compute the dimension of moduli spaces of symplectic vortices on a closed Riemann surface [3]. Using insights from these results, we may attempt to compute the axial R-anomaly and find the dimension of a moduli space of open symplectic vortices on an open Riemann surface. In what follows, we shall assume that we have a compact open Riemann surface, Σ, with arbitrary genus and an arbitrary number of boundary circles.

The axial R-anomaly can be deduced by investigating the zero-modes of the fermionic fields via their kinetic terms

$$\frac{i}{2e^2}\eta_a \overleftrightarrow{\nabla}^A * \psi^a - \frac{1}{4e^2}\kappa_a \overleftrightarrow{\nabla}^A \psi^a + \frac{1}{4} g_{j\overline{k}}\, \rho^j \wedge (\phi^* \overleftrightarrow{\nabla}^A)\overline{\chi}^{\overline{k}} + \frac{1}{4} g_{j\overline{k}}\, \overline{\rho}^{\overline{k}} \wedge (\phi^* \overleftrightarrow{\nabla}^A)\chi^j. \tag{6.31}$$

Firstly, using integration by parts together with the boundary conditions found in Section 5.5, one can show that $(\phi^*\nabla^A)_{\bar{z}}$ and $(\nabla^A)_{\bar{z}}$ are the adjoint operators of $(\phi^*\nabla^A)_z$ and $(\nabla^A)_z$, e.g.,

$$\frac{1}{4} g_{j\overline{k}}\, \overline{\rho}^{\overline{k}}_z (\phi^*\nabla^A)_{\bar{z}} \chi^j = \frac{1}{4} g_{j\overline{k}}\, \chi^j \overline{(\phi^*\nabla^A)_z \rho^{\overline{k}}_{\bar{z}}}, \tag{6.32}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
\#\{\chi \text{ zero modes}\} &= \dim \ker(\phi^*\nabla^A)_{\bar{z}} = \dim \operatorname{coker}(\phi^*\nabla^A)_z \\
\#\{\overline{\chi} \text{ zero modes}\} &= \dim \ker(\phi^*\nabla^A)_{\bar{z}} = \dim \operatorname{coker}(\phi^*\nabla^A)_z \\
\#\{\overline{\rho}_z \text{ zero modes}\} &= \dim \ker(\phi^*\nabla^A)_z = \dim \operatorname{coker}(\phi^*\nabla^A)_{\bar{z}} \\
\#\{\rho_{\bar{z}} \text{ zero modes}\} &= \dim \ker(\phi^*\nabla^A)_z = \dim \operatorname{coker}(\phi^*\nabla^A)_{\bar{z}} \\
\#\{\psi_z \text{ zero modes}\} &= \dim \ker(\nabla^A)_{\bar{z}} = \dim \operatorname{coker}(\nabla^A)_z \\
\#\{\psi_{\bar{z}} \text{ zero modes}\} &= \dim \ker(\nabla^A)_{\bar{z}} = \dim \operatorname{coker}(\nabla^A)_z \\
\#\{\overline{\lambda} \text{ zero modes}\} &= \dim \ker(\nabla^A)_z = \dim \operatorname{coker}(\nabla^A)_{\bar{z}} \\
\#\{\lambda \text{ zero modes}\} &= \dim \ker(\nabla^A)_z = \dim \operatorname{coker}(\nabla^A)_{\bar{z}},
\end{aligned} \tag{6.33}$$

where we have defined the fields

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_a &= \frac{i2\sqrt{2}\eta_a + i\sqrt{2}\kappa_a}{2} \\ \overline{\lambda}_a &= \frac{i2\sqrt{2}\eta_a - i\sqrt{2}\kappa_a}{2}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.34}$$

It is well-known that if a particular fermionic field, e.g., ψ, has charge $q(\psi)$ under the axial $U(1)$ R-symmetry, then the path integral measure $\mathcal{D}\psi$ transforms under the R-symmetry with charge $-q(\psi)$ times the number of ψ zero modes. The path integral measure in the open gauged A-model then transforms with charge $-\mathcal{A}$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is the anomaly, given explicitly as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A} &= [q(\chi) + q(\overline{\chi})](\ker\, \phi^*\nabla^A_{\bar{z}}) + [q(\overline{\rho}_z) + q(\rho_{\bar{z}})](\ker\, \phi^*\nabla^A_z) \\ &\quad + [q(\psi_z) + q(\psi_{\bar{z}})](\ker\, \nabla^A_{\bar{z}}) + [q(\overline{\lambda}) + q(\lambda)](\ker\, \nabla^A_z) \\ &= [q(\chi) - q(\rho_{\bar{z}})](\text{index}\, \phi^*\nabla^A_{\bar{z}}) + [q(\psi_z) - q(\lambda)](\text{index}\, \nabla^A_{\bar{z}}) \\ &= 2(\text{index}\, \phi^*\nabla^A_{\bar{z}}) + 2(\text{index}\, \nabla^A_{\bar{z}}),\end{aligned} \tag{6.35}$$

where we have used (6.33) as well as $q(\overline{\rho}_z) = -q(\chi)$ and $q(\lambda) = -q(\psi_z)$.

In order to evaluate the anomaly, we ought to double the open worldsheet as well as the bundles on it, as in [8], in order to form a closed worldsheet, on which the indices of the relevant operators can be evaluated. This is done by taking the metric on the worldsheet close to each component of $\partial\Sigma$ to be that of a flat cylinder, and gluing Σ with its orientation reversal, Σ^*. The resulting closed Riemann surface is denoted $\Sigma\#\Sigma^*$.

The corresponding bundles over Σ and Σ^* shall be glued using the relevant boundary conditions. To demonstrate this, let us first consider the index for $\nabla^A_{\bar{z}}$. The boundary conditions (c.f. Section 5.5) for the relevant fermionic fields are

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^a_z &= -\psi^a_{\bar{z}} \\ \overline{\lambda}_a &= \lambda_a.\end{aligned} \tag{6.36}$$

Now, let us consider $\overline{\lambda}_a$ and ψ^a_z as fields on Σ, and λ_a and $-\psi^a_{\bar{z}}$ as fields on Σ^*. By the boundary conditions above, $\overline{\lambda}_a$ on Σ and λ_a on Σ^* continuously glue along $\partial\Sigma$, and define a continuous section of $\mathfrak{g}_P\#\mathfrak{g}_P$ which we denote $\overline{\lambda}_a\#\lambda_a$. Likewise, ψ^a_z and $-\psi^a_{\bar{z}}$ define a continuous section $\psi^a_z\#(-\psi^a_{\bar{z}})$ of $(\mathfrak{g}_P\#\mathfrak{g}_P)\otimes K_{\Sigma\#\Sigma^*}$. Then, if $\nabla^A_{\bar{z}}\overline{\lambda}_a = 0$, $\overline{\lambda}_a\#\lambda_a$ is holomorphic on $\Sigma \subset \Sigma\#\Sigma^*$. If $\nabla^A_z\lambda_a = 0$, λ_a is holomorphic on Σ^* due to orientation reversal, and hence $\overline{\lambda}_a\#\lambda_a$ is holomorphic on $\Sigma^* \subset \Sigma\#\Sigma^*$. Thus, if $\nabla^A_{\bar{z}}\overline{\lambda}_a = 0$ on Σ and $\nabla^A_z\lambda_a = 0$ on Σ^*, then $\overline{\lambda}_a\#\lambda_a$ is entirely holomorphic on $\Sigma\#\Sigma^*$.

Similarly, if $\nabla^A_{\bar{z}}\psi^a_z = 0$ on Σ and $\nabla^A_z\psi^a_{\bar{z}} = 0$ on Σ^*, then $\psi^a_z\#(-\psi^a_{\bar{z}})$ is entirely holomorphic on $\Sigma\#\Sigma^*$. According to [8], this implies that the index of $\nabla^A_{\bar{z}}$ is the index of the Dolbeault operator of $(\mathfrak{g}_P\#\mathfrak{g}_P)$, which is calculated to be

$$\begin{aligned}\text{index}\, \nabla^A_{\bar{z}} &= \dim\, H^0(\Sigma\#\Sigma^*, \mathfrak{g}_P\#\mathfrak{g}_P) - \dim\, H^0(\Sigma\#\Sigma^*, (\mathfrak{g}_P\#\mathfrak{g}_P)\otimes K_{\Sigma\#\Sigma^*}) \\ &= c_1(\mathfrak{g}_P\#\mathfrak{g}_P) + \dim(G)(2 - 2g - h)\end{aligned} \tag{6.37}$$

where g is the genus and h is the number of boundary circles of the worldsheet Σ. For compact G, $c_1(\mathfrak{g}_P\#\mathfrak{g}_P) = 0$.

The index for $\phi^*\nabla^A_{\bar{z}}$ can analogously be determined. In fact, the proof is a direct generalization of that found in Section 39.3.3 of [8] for the non-gauged case. Before A-twisting, we found boundary conditions (c.f. Section 5.5) which map the boundary to a G-invariant Lagrangian submanifold, L. In other words, at $\partial\Sigma$, the scalar fields ϕ^I constitute a section $\phi : \partial\Sigma \to E_L$ of the associated bundle $E_L = P_{\partial\Sigma} \times_G L$. Hence, we shall fix a bosonic background of the open Riemann surface Σ, i.e., a map

$$\phi : (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma) \to (P \times_G X, P_{\partial\Sigma} \times_G L), \tag{6.38}$$

labelled by $\phi_*[\Sigma] \in H_2^G(X)$ and $\phi_*[\partial\Sigma] \in H_1^G(L)$. Next, recall from Section 2 that before A-twisting, the matter fermionic fields are the sections $\Psi_\pm \in \Gamma(\Sigma; S_\pm \otimes \phi^* \ker d\pi_E)$.[65] The boundary conditions for the fermion fields were stated for a Minkowski worldsheet as $(\Psi^I_- + \Psi^I_+)$ is tangent to L and $(\Psi^I_- - \Psi^I_+)$ is normal to L. This can be restated for a Euclidean worldsheet. First, as in [8], the spin bundles of opposite chirality (S_+ and S_-) can be identified at each boundary. Then, the boundary condition can be written succinctly as

$$\tau(\Psi_-) = \Psi_+, \tag{6.39}$$

where the map $\tau : \ker d\pi_E|_L \to \ker d\pi_E|_L$ is the identity on $\ker d\pi_{E_L} \to E_L$ (which locally looks like $\Sigma \times TL \to \Sigma \times L$), and is $(-1)\times$ the identity on $\ker d\pi_{E_{L^\perp}} \to E_L$ (which locally looks like $\Sigma \times NL \to \Sigma \times L$).[66]

Next, $\Psi^I_\pm$ is decomposed into $\psi^i_\pm$ and $\overline{\psi}^{\bar{\imath}}_\pm$, which are valued in $\phi^*\ker d\pi^{(1,0)}_E$ (which locally looks like $\phi^*T^{(1,0)}X$) and $\phi^*\ker d\pi^{(0,1)}_E$ (which locally looks like $\phi^*T^{(0,1)}X$), respectively.[67] The map τ acts linearly on $\ker d\pi^{(1,0)}_E|_L \oplus \ker d\pi^{(0,1)}_E|_L$, whereby the $(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$ components are exchanged. The reason for this is that if $t \in \ker d\pi_{E_L}$, then $Jt \in \ker d\pi_{E_{L^\perp}}$, and therefore $\tau : (t - iJt) \in \ker d\pi^{(1,0)}_E|_L \to (t + iJt) \in \ker d\pi^{(0,1)}_E|_L$. Hence,

$$\tau : \phi^*\ker\, d\pi^{(1,0)}_E|_{\partial\Sigma} \to \phi^*\ker\, d\pi^{(0,1)}_E|_{\partial\Sigma}. \tag{6.40}$$

The boundary condition (6.39) can then be written as

$$\tau(\psi_-) = \overline{\psi}_+,\ \tau(\overline{\psi}_-) = \psi_+. \tag{6.41}$$

After A-twisting, these become

$$\tau(\chi) = \overline{\chi},\ \tau(\overline{\rho}_z) = \rho_{\bar{z}}. \tag{6.42}$$

These boundary conditions are analogous to those given in (6.36), and can be used to continuously glue $\phi^*\ker d\pi^{(1,0)}_E$ over Σ with $\phi^*\ker d\pi^{(0,1)}_E$ over the orientation reversal Σ^*, by considering χ and $\overline{\rho}_z$ as fields on Σ and $\overline{\chi}$ and $\rho_{\bar{z}}$ as fields on Σ^*. In this way, we obtain a continuous section of $\phi^*\ker d\pi^{(1,0)}_E \# \phi^*\ker d\pi^{(0,1)}_E$ (denoted $\chi\#\overline{\chi}$) and a continuous

[65] For this subsection, we shall follow the real notation of [8] whereby $\psi^I_\pm$ is written as $\Psi^I_\pm$.

[66] The vector bundles $\ker d\pi_{E_L} \to E_L$ and $\ker d\pi_{E_{L^\perp}} \to E_L$ are respectively the kernels of the derivatives $d\pi_{E_L} : TE_L \to T\Sigma$ and $d\pi_{E_{L^\perp}} : NE_L \to T\Sigma$.

[67] The vector bundles $\ker d\pi^{(1,0)}_E \to E$ and $\ker d\pi^{(0,1)}_E \to E$ are respectively the kernels of the derivatives $d\pi^{(1,0)}_E : T^{(1,0)}E \to T\Sigma$ and $d\pi^{(0,1)}_E : T^{(0,1)}E \to T\Sigma$.

section of $(\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(1,0)}\#\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(0,1)})^* \otimes K_{\Sigma\#\Sigma^*}$ (denoted $\overline{\rho}_z\#\rho_{\bar{z}}$). Now, if $\phi^*\nabla_{\bar{z}}^A\chi = 0$, $\chi\#\overline{\chi}$ is holomorphic on $\Sigma \subset \Sigma\#\Sigma^*$, and if $\phi^*\nabla_z^A\overline{\chi} = 0$, $\chi\#\overline{\chi}$ is holomorphic on $\Sigma^* \subset \Sigma\#\Sigma^*$ due to orientation reversal. Hence, if $\phi^*\nabla_{\bar{z}}^A\chi = 0$ and $\phi^*\nabla_z^A\overline{\chi} = 0$, then $\chi\#\overline{\chi}$ is entirely holomorphic on $\Sigma\#\Sigma^*$. Analogously, if $\phi^*\nabla_{\bar{z}}^A\overline{\rho}_z = \phi^*\nabla_z^A\rho_{\bar{z}} = 0$, $\overline{\rho}_z\#\rho_{\bar{z}}$ is entirely holomorphic on $\Sigma\#\Sigma^*$. This implies that the index of $\phi^*\nabla_{\bar{z}}^A$ is the index of the Dolbeault operator of $\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(1,0)}\#\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(0,1)}$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{index}\ \phi^*\nabla_{\bar{z}}^A &= \dim\, H^0(\Sigma\#\Sigma^*, \mathcal{E}\#\mathcal{E}^*) - \dim\, H^0(\Sigma\#\Sigma^*, (\mathcal{E}\#\mathcal{E}^*)^* \otimes K_{\Sigma\#\Sigma^*}) \\ &= c_1(\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(1,0)}\#\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(0,1)}) + \text{rank}(\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(1,0)})(2-2g-h),\end{aligned} \tag{6.43}$$

where $\mathcal{E} = \phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(1,0)}$.

In addition, we note that the map τ is associated with the orthogonal decomposition

$$(\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(1,0)})|_L = \phi^*[\ker\, d\pi_{E_L}]^{(1,0)} \oplus\ i\phi^*[\ker\, d\pi_{E_L}]^{(1,0)}, \tag{6.44}$$

which is obtained from $(\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E)|_L = \phi^*\ker\, d\pi_{E_L} \oplus \phi^*\ker\, d\pi_{E_{L^\perp}}$ via the projection $(1-iJ) : \phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E \to \phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(1,0)}$. Following the general argument in [8], this allows us to identify $c_1(\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(1,0)}\#\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(0,1)})$ with $\mu(\phi^*\ker d\pi_E^{(1,0)}, \phi^*[\ker\, d\pi_{E_L}]^{(1,0)})$ which is known as the Maslov index of the pair $(\phi^*\ker d\pi_E^{(1,0)}, \phi^*[\ker\, d\pi_{E_L}]^{(1,0)})$. Thus, we obtain

$$\text{index}\ \phi^*\nabla_{\bar{z}}^A = \mu(\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(1,0)}, \phi^*[\ker\, d\pi_{E_L}]^{(1,0)}) + \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(X)(2-2g-h), \tag{6.45}$$

where we have used $\text{rank}(\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(1,0)}) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(X)$.

We find from (6.37) and (6.45) that for compact G, the axial R-anomaly is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A} &= 2(\text{index}\ \phi^*\nabla_{\bar{z}}^A) + 2(\text{index}\ \nabla_{\bar{z}}^A) \\ &= 2\mu(\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(1,0)}, \phi^*[\ker\, d\pi_{E_L}]^{(1,0)}) + 2(\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(X) + \dim(G))(2-2g-h),\end{aligned} \tag{6.46}$$

Hence, in order for correlation functions to be nonzero, an appropriate number of operators with suitable axial R-charge should be inserted into the path integral, such that axial R-symmetry is preserved.

As in the closed case [3, 31], the virtual complex dimension of the moduli space of open symplectic vortices is given by the *difference* of the indices (6.45) and (6.37), which, for compact G, is

$$\mu(\phi^*\ker\, d\pi_E^{(1,0)}, \phi^*[\ker\, d\pi_{E_L}]^{(1,0)}) + (\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(X) - \dim(G))(2-2g-h). \tag{6.47}$$

The reason for this is that the elliptic *linearized* operator (whose index is the virtual complex dimension ([4], page 142)) one derives from the open symplectic vortex equations is essentially the sum of the operators $\phi^*\nabla_{\bar{z}}^A$ and ∇_z^A, where the index of the latter is $(\text{index}\ \nabla_z^A = -\text{index}\ \nabla_{\bar{z}}^A)$ [31]. The Maslov index in (6.47) can be regarded as the equivariant Maslov index for the pair (X, L), since for trivial G it reduces to $\mu(\phi^*T^{(1,0)}X, \phi^*[TL]^{(1,0)})$.

6.4 $\hat{Q}_A^2 \neq 0$ Anomaly

We have previously defined open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants as integrals over the moduli space of open symplectic vortices. However, as mentioned, we have in fact ignored problems related to singularities in this moduli space. In particular, we have ignored the singular boundary strata which have codimension one in the moduli space, which occur due to disk bubbling [33]. This phenomenon obstructs integration over the moduli space. This is also a problem for ordinary open Gromov-Witten invariants, since disk bubbling also causes singular codimension one boundary strata in the moduli space of open worldsheet instantons of the non-gauged open A-model [34]. Disk bubbling manifests itself in the open A-model as a nonpertubative instanton effect which causes the violation of the nilpotency of the scalar supercharge, i.e., $Q_A^2 \neq 0$ ([8], page 833). Moreover, this anomaly of the supersymmetry algebra also spoils the cohomological structure of the supersymmetric ground states of the open A-model, which are identified with elements of the Floer cohomology group for a pair of intersecting Lagrangian submanifolds. In fact, the anomaly implies that there are no supersymmetric ground states, and therefore supersymmetry is *broken*.

Now, the fact that open symplectic vortices are open worldsheet instantons when G is trivial means that open symplectic vortices cause $Q_A^2 \neq 0$ and therefore supersymmetry breaking, for trivial G. Thus, for nontrivial G, we expect that open symplectic vortices will cause an analogous effect in the open G-gauged A-model, i.e., $\hat{Q}_A^2 \neq 0$ (where $\hat{Q}_A = Q_A + Q_{BRST}$, with Q_{BRST} being the BRST charge), indicating that the moduli space of open symplectic vortices has singular codimension one boundary strata, and implying that the supersymmetric ground states of the open gauged A-model (which we expect to be elements of the vortex Floer cohomology group [29, 35] for a pair of intersecting G-invariant Lagrangian submanifolds) would not only lose their cohomological structure, but would cease to be supersymmetric, implying *supersymmetry breaking*.

For the non-gauged open A-model, it is difficult to directly compute the violation of $Q_A^2 = 0$ in general; one can only do so for specific examples, e.g., $X = S^2$ [27]. Fortunately, at least for toric manifolds with $c_1(X) \geq 0$, one is able to use the mirror theory, which does not contain solitonic objects, to compute this violation in general (and identify the condition whereby it vanishes) via canonical quantization, as shown by Hori [8, 27]. The condition found was that for a pair of Lagrangian submanifolds supporting flat $U(1)$ bundles, the $Q_A^2 \neq 0$ anomaly vanishes if and only if the value of the superpotential on the mirror B-branes match each other, and in such a case supersymmetry is manifest.

It is thus natural to investigate the $\hat{Q}_A^2 \neq 0$ anomaly due to open symplectic vortices in the open gauged A-model via canonical quantization of its mirror theory. We shall do this for toric target spaces $X = \mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$, i.e., by topologically A-twisting the $U(1)^k$-GNLSM on an infinite strip whose boundaries are mapped to different equivariant

A-branes in X,[68] whose mirror (c.f. Section 5.4) has the (Euclidean) action

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_E = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2x \Big[& \sum_c^k \sum_d^k (g_{cd}\partial_\mu\theta_c\partial^\mu\overline{\theta}_d - \frac{i}{2}g_{cd}\overline{\chi}^\theta_{-c}(\overleftrightarrow{\partial_+})\chi^\theta_{-d} - \frac{i}{2}g_{cd}\overline{\chi}^\theta_{+c}(\overleftrightarrow{\partial_-})\chi^\theta_{+d} - g_{cd}E^\theta_c\overline{E}^\theta_d) \\
& + \sum_c^k \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2}\Big((\widetilde{F}_{12c})^2 + \partial_\mu\widetilde{\sigma}_c\partial^\mu\overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c - (\widetilde{D}_c)^2 - \frac{i}{2}\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{+c}(\overleftrightarrow{\partial_-})\widetilde{\lambda}_{+c} - \frac{i}{2}\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{-c}(\overleftrightarrow{\partial_+})\widetilde{\lambda}_{-c}\Big) \\
& - \frac{1}{2}\Big(\sum_j^N\sum_c^k\sum_d^k \widetilde{Q}_{jc}v^j_d(\widetilde{\sigma}_cE^\theta_d - i\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{+c}\chi^\theta_{-d} - i\widetilde{\lambda}_{-c}\overline{\chi}^\theta_{+d} + (\widetilde{D}_c - \widetilde{F}_{12c})\theta_d) + \sum_c^k(\sum_j^N \widetilde{Q}_{jc}\hat{s}^j - \widetilde{t}_c)(\widetilde{D}_c - \widetilde{F}_{12c}) \\
& + \sum_j^N e^{-\sum_c v^j_c\theta_c - \hat{s}^j}(-\sum_c^k v^j_c\overline{\chi}^\theta_{+c}\sum_d^k v^j_d\chi^\theta_{-d} - \sum_c^k v^j_cE^\theta_c) \\
& + \sum_j^N\sum_c^k\sum_d^k \widetilde{Q}_{jc}v^j_d(\overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c\overline{E}^\theta_d - i\widetilde{\lambda}_{+c}\overline{\chi}^\theta_{-d} - i\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{-c}\chi^\theta_{+d} + (\widetilde{D}_c + \widetilde{F}_{12c})\overline{\theta}_d) + \sum_c^k(\sum_j^N \widetilde{Q}_{jc}\overline{\hat{s}}^j - \overline{\widetilde{t}}_c)(\widetilde{D}_c + \widetilde{F}_{12c}) \\
& + \sum_j^N e^{-\sum_c v^j_c\overline{\theta}_c - \overline{\hat{s}}^j}(-\sum_c^k v^j_c\overline{\chi}^\theta_{-c}\sum_d^k v^j_d\chi^\theta_{+d} - \sum_c^k v^j_c\overline{E}^\theta_c)\Big)\Big],
\end{aligned}
\tag{6.48}
$$

where $d^2x = dx^1dx^2$ and $\partial_\pm = i\partial_2 \pm \partial_1$. Performing the topological A-twist for the mirror theory amounts to the following field redefinitions:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\varphi}_c &= -i2\widetilde{\sigma}_c & \widetilde{\xi}_c &= \overline{\widetilde{\sigma}}_c/4 \\
\widetilde{\lambda}_c &= \widetilde{\lambda}_{+c} & \overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_c &= \overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{-c} \\
\widetilde{\psi}_{+c} &= \frac{2i}{\sqrt{2}}\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{+c} & \widetilde{\psi}_{-c} &= \frac{2i}{\sqrt{2}}\widetilde{\lambda}_{-c} \\
\chi^{\theta c} &= \chi^{\theta c}_+ & \overline{\chi}^{\theta c} &= \overline{\chi}^{\theta c}_- \\
\mathcal{X}^{\theta c}_+ &= 2\overline{\chi}^{\theta c}_+ & \mathcal{X}^{\theta c}_- &= 2\chi^{\theta c}_-,
\end{aligned}
\tag{6.49}
$$

where $\widetilde{\lambda}_c$, $\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_c$, $\chi^{\theta c}$ and $\overline{\chi}^{\theta c}$ are scalars, while $\widetilde{\psi}_{\pm c} = i\widetilde{\psi}_2 \pm \widetilde{\psi}_1$ and $\mathcal{X}^{\theta c}_\pm = i\mathcal{X}^{\theta c}_2 \pm \mathcal{X}^{\theta c}_1$ are one-forms. Hence, the mirror action of the open $U(1)^k$-gauged A-model with toric target

[68] These equivariant A-branes are labelled by the GLSM parameters $s^{(1)}_j$ and $s^{(2)}_j$, which determine the position of their respective mirror D0-branes (see footnote 60).

$X = \mathbb{C}^N//U(1)^{N-k}$ is

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_E = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2x\Big[& \sum_c^k\sum_d^k (g_{cd}\partial_\mu\theta_c\partial^\mu\overline{\theta}_d - \frac{i}{4}g_{cd}\overline{\chi}_c^\theta(\overleftrightarrow{\partial_+})\mathcal{X}_{-d}^\theta - \frac{i}{4}g_{cd}\mathcal{X}_{+c}^\theta(\overleftrightarrow{\partial_-})\chi_d^\theta - g_{cd}E_c^\theta\overline{E}_d^\theta) \\
& + \sum_c^k \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2}\Big((\widetilde{F}_{12c})^2 + i2\partial_\mu\widetilde{\varphi}_c\partial^\mu\widetilde{\xi}_c - (\widetilde{D}_c)^2 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}\widetilde{\psi}_{+c}(\overleftrightarrow{\partial_-})\widetilde{\lambda}_c - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_c(\overleftrightarrow{\partial_+})\widetilde{\psi}_{-c}\Big) \\
& - \frac{1}{2}\Big(\sum_j^N\sum_c^k\sum_d^k \widetilde{Q}_{jc}v_d^j(\frac{i}{2}\widetilde{\varphi}_cE_d^\theta - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}\widetilde{\psi}_{+c}\mathcal{X}_{-d}^\theta - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}\widetilde{\psi}_{-c}\mathcal{X}_{+d}^\theta + (\widetilde{D}_c - \widetilde{F}_{12c})\theta_d) \\
& + \sum_c^k(\sum_j^N \widetilde{Q}_{jc}\hat{s}^j - \widetilde{t}_c)(\widetilde{D}_c - \widetilde{F}_{12c}) + \sum_j^N e^{-\sum_c v_c^j\theta_c - \hat{s}^j}(-\frac{1}{4}\sum_c^k v_c^j\mathcal{X}_{+c}^\theta\sum_d^k v_d^j\mathcal{X}_{-d}^\theta - \sum_c^k v_c^jE_c^\theta) \\
& + \sum_j^N\sum_c^k\sum_d^k \widetilde{Q}_{jc}v_d^j(4\widetilde{\xi}_c\overline{E}_d^\theta - i\widetilde{\lambda}_c\overline{\chi}_d^\theta - i\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_c\chi_d^\theta + (\widetilde{D}_c + \widetilde{F}_{12c})\overline{\theta}_d) \\
& + \sum_c^k(\sum_j^N \widetilde{Q}_{jc}\overline{\hat{s}}^j - \overline{\widetilde{t}}_c)(\widetilde{D}_c + \widetilde{F}_{12c}) + \sum_j^N e^{-\sum_c v_c^j\overline{\theta}_c - \hat{s}^j}(-\sum_c^k v_c^j\overline{\chi}_c^\theta\sum_d^k v_d^j\chi_d^\theta - \sum_c^k v_c^j\overline{E}_c^\theta)\Big)\Big],
\end{aligned}
\tag{6.50}
$$

which is invariant under the supersymmetry transformations

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta_{Q_A}\widetilde{A}_{1c} &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\epsilon\widetilde{\psi}_{1c} & \delta_{Q_A}\widetilde{\psi}_{-c} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\epsilon\partial_-\widetilde{\varphi}_c \\
\delta_{Q_A}\widetilde{A}_{2c} &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\epsilon\widetilde{\psi}_{2c} & \delta_{Q_A}\widetilde{\psi}_{+c} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\epsilon\partial_+\widetilde{\varphi}_c \\
\delta_{Q_A}\widetilde{\varphi}_c &= 0 & \delta_{Q_A}\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_c &= -i\epsilon(\widetilde{F}_{12c} + \widetilde{D}_c) \\
\delta_{Q_A}\widetilde{\xi}_c &= -\frac{i\epsilon(\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_c + \widetilde{\lambda}_c)}{4} & \delta_{Q_A}\widetilde{\lambda}_c &= i\epsilon(\widetilde{F}_{12c} + \widetilde{D}_c) \\
\delta_{Q_A}\widetilde{D}_c &= -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\epsilon(\partial_1\widetilde{\psi}_{2c} - \partial_2\widetilde{\psi}_{1c}) & \delta_{Q_A}\mathcal{X}_-^{\theta c} &= -2i\epsilon\,\partial_-\theta^c \\
\delta_{Q_A}\theta^c &= 0 & \delta_{Q_A}\mathcal{X}_+^{\theta c} &= 2i\epsilon\,\partial_+\theta^c \\
\delta_{Q_A}\overline{\theta}^c &= \epsilon(\chi^{\theta c} - \overline{\chi}^{\theta c}) & \delta_{Q_A}\overline{\chi}^{\theta c} &= \epsilon\overline{E}^{\theta c} \\
\delta_{Q_A}E^{\theta c} &= i\epsilon\partial^\mu\mathcal{X}_\mu^{\theta c} & \delta_{Q_A}\chi^{\theta c} &= \epsilon\overline{E}^{\theta c} \\
\delta_{Q_A}\overline{E}^{\theta c} &= 0
\end{aligned}
\tag{6.51}
$$

generated by the supercharge Q_A. However, this mirror theory is in fact a gauge theory, and any consistent quantization procedure should include gauge fixing, in order to remove unphysical degrees of freedom.

To this end, we shall choose the Lorentz gauge

$$
\langle\psi'|\partial_\mu\widetilde{A}_c^\mu|\psi\rangle = 0 \tag{6.52}
$$

(where $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi'\rangle$) are physical states), which is effected by including the following BRST gauge fixing action

$$S_{BRST} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{c}^{k}\frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2}\int d^2x(-iB_c\partial_\mu\widetilde{A}_c^\mu - (B_c)^2 + \partial_\mu\widetilde{b}_c\partial^\mu\widetilde{c}_c - i\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\partial_\mu\widetilde{b}_c\widetilde{\psi}_c^\mu), \tag{6.53}$$

where $\widetilde{b}_c$ and $\widetilde{c}_c$ are fermionic ghost fields, while B_c is a bosonic auxiliary field. As expected, the first term explicitly breaks the $U(1)^k$ gauge symmetry of the gauged LG model.

Now, note that the gauge fixing action (6.53) can be rewritten as

$$S_{BRST} = \epsilon^{-1}(\delta_{Q_A} + \delta_{BRST})\Big\{\sum_{c}^{k}\frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2}\int d^2x(-i\widetilde{b}_c\partial_\mu\widetilde{A}_c^\mu + \widetilde{b}_cB_c)\Big\}, \tag{6.54}$$

where we have performed integration by parts, and used the boundary condition $(\widetilde{\lambda}_{-c} - \overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_{+c}) = 0$ (which is equivalent to $\widetilde{\psi}_{1c} = 0$) that we have previously imposed, as well as the boundary condition

$$\partial_1\widetilde{c}_c = 0, \tag{6.55}$$

which we impose at present. Here, δ_{BRST} is the standard BRST symmetry variation given by

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{BRST}\widetilde{A}_{\mu c} &= i\epsilon\partial_\mu\widetilde{c}_c\\ \delta_{BRST}\widetilde{b}_c &= \epsilon B_c\\ \delta_{BRST}\widetilde{c}_c &= 0\\ \delta_{BRST}B_c &= 0,\end{aligned} \tag{6.56}$$

with the BRST variations of all other fields being equal to zero. For the unphysical fields used for gauge fixing, the supersymmetry transformations are $\delta_{Q_A}\widetilde{b}_c = 0$ and $\delta_{Q_A}B_c = 0$, while[69]

$$\delta_{Q_A}\widetilde{c}_c = -\frac{i}{2}\epsilon\widetilde{\varphi}_c. \tag{6.57}$$

Now, $\delta_{Q_A}^2 \propto \delta_G(\widetilde{\varphi})$ and $\delta_{BRST}^2 = 0$ on all fields.[70] In addition, we can show that

$$(\delta_{Q_A} + \delta_{BRST})^2 = 0 \tag{6.58}$$

on all fields. This implies that the BRST gauge fixing action (6.54) is in fact invariant under $\hat{\delta} = \delta_{Q_A} + \delta_{BRST}$. Since the physical action (6.48) is also invariant under δ_{BRST}, this further implies that the entire action $S + S_{BRST}$ is invariant under $\hat{\delta} = (\delta_{Q_A} + \delta_{BRST})$. This suggests that the relevant symmetry of the action after gauge fixing is that which is generated by $\hat{Q}_A = Q_A + Q_{BRST}$.

The conjugate momentum for any field, denoted X, is defined as

$$\pi_X = \frac{\partial L_E}{\partial(\partial_2 X)}, \tag{6.59}$$

[69]Note that with respect to (6.57), the boundary condition (6.55) obeys A-type supersymmetry, since the boundary condition on $\widetilde{\varphi}_c$ is $\partial_1\widetilde{\varphi}_c = 0$.

[70]The transformation $\delta_G(\widetilde{\varphi})$ is a $U(1)^k$ gauge transformation whose local parameter is $\widetilde{\varphi}_c$.

with the convention that derivatives are taken from the right for fermionic fields. The canonical conjugate momenta are[71]

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{\theta^c} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} g_{cd} \partial_2 \overline{\theta}^d \\
\pi_{\overline{\theta}^c} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} g_{cd} \partial_2 \theta^d \\
\pi_{\chi^{\theta c}} &= \frac{1}{4\pi} g_{cd} \mathcal{X}_+^{\theta c} \\
\pi_{\mathcal{X}_-^{\theta c}} &= \frac{1}{4\pi} g_{cd} \overline{\chi}^{\theta c} \\
\pi_{\widetilde{\varphi}_c} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2} i 2 \partial_2 \widetilde{\xi}_c \\
\pi_{\widetilde{\xi}_c} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2} i 2 \partial_2 \widetilde{\varphi}_c \\
\pi_{\widetilde{\lambda}_c} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2i} \widetilde{\psi}_{+c} \\
\pi_{\widetilde{\psi}_{-c}} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2i} \overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_c \\
\pi_{\widetilde{A}_{1c}} &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \Big(\frac{1}{\widetilde{e}_c^2} \widetilde{F}_{12c} + i \mathrm{Im} \Big(\sum_j^N \widetilde{Q}_{jc} \Big(\langle v^j, \theta \rangle + \hat{s}^j \Big) - \widetilde{t}_c \Big) \Big) \\
\pi_{\widetilde{A}_{2c}} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2} (-i B_c) \\
\pi_{\widetilde{b}_c} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2} \big(\partial_2 \widetilde{c}_c - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} (\widetilde{\psi}_{+c} + \widetilde{\psi}_{-c}) \big) \\
\pi_{\widetilde{c}_c} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2} \big(\partial_2 \widetilde{b}_c \big).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.60}$$

The equal-time canonical commutation relations are

$$\begin{aligned}
[X_i(x^1), \pi_{X_j}(y^1)] &= \delta_{ij} \delta(x^1 - y^1) \\
[X_i(x^1), X_j(y^1)] &= 0 \\
[\pi_{X_i}(x^1), \pi_{X_j}(y^1)] &= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{6.61}$$

for $X_i = \{\theta^c, \overline{\theta}^c, \widetilde{\varphi}_c, \widetilde{\xi}_c, \widetilde{A}_{1c}, \widetilde{A}_{2c}\}$, and the equal-time canonical anticommutation relations are

$$\begin{aligned}
\{X_i(x^1), \pi_{X_j}(y^1)\} &= \delta_{ij} \delta(x^1 - y^1) \\
\{X_i(x^1), X_j(y^1)\} &= 0 \\
\{\pi_{X_i}(x^1), \pi_{X_j}(y^1)\} &= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{6.62}$$

for $X_i = \{\chi^{\theta c}, \mathcal{X}_-^{\theta c}, \widetilde{\lambda}_c, \widetilde{\psi}_{-c}, \widetilde{b}_c, \widetilde{c}_c\}$. In addition, all commutators between a bosonic operator and a fermionic operator vanish, and the commutation relations obeyed by E_c^θ and $\widetilde{D}_c$ are

[71] Note that in order to derive a consistent set of anticommutation relations, we convert the fermionic kinetic terms with ∂_2 derivatives to a form identical to that found in closed theories via integration by parts, e.g. $-\frac{i}{4} g_{cd} \overline{\chi}_c^\theta i (\overleftrightarrow{\partial_2}) \mathcal{X}_{-d}^\theta \to -\frac{i}{2} g_{cd} \overline{\chi}_c^\theta (i \partial_2) \mathcal{X}_{-d}^\theta$. The symmetric form of the kinetic terms are in fact not necessary because a Lagrangian on a Euclidean worldsheet is not real.

specified by their equations of motion, which hold as operator equations due to Ehrenfest's theorem. Then, the non-vanishing canonical commutation and anticommutation relations are

$$\begin{aligned}
[\theta^c(x^1), g_{de}\partial_2\overline{\theta}^e(y^1)] &= 2\pi\delta^c_d\delta(x^1-y^1)\\
[\overline{\theta}^c(x^1), g_{de}\partial_2\theta^e(y^1)] &= 2\pi\delta^c_d\delta(x^1-y^1)\\
\{\chi^{\theta c}(x^1), \mathcal{X}^{\theta d}_+(y^1)\} &= 4\pi g^{cd}\delta(x^1-y^1)\\
\{\mathcal{X}^{\theta c}_-(x^1), \overline{\chi}^{\theta d}(y^1)\} &= 4\pi g^{cd}\delta(x^1-y^1)\\
[\widetilde{\varphi}_c(x^1), \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}^2_d} i2\partial_2\widetilde{\xi}_d(y^1)] &= 2\pi\delta_{cd}\delta(x^1-y^1)\\
[\widetilde{\xi}_c(x^1), \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}^2_d} i2\partial_2\widetilde{\varphi}_d(y^1)] &= 2\pi\delta_{cd}\delta(x^1-y^1)\\
\{\widetilde{\lambda}_c(x^1), \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}^2_d}\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2i}\widetilde{\psi}_{+d}(y^1)\} &= 2\pi\delta_{cd}\delta(x^1-y^1)\\
\{\widetilde{\psi}_{-c}(x^1), \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}^2_d}\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2i}\widetilde{\overline{\lambda}}_d(y^1)\} &= 2\pi\delta_{cd}\delta(x^1-y^1)\\
[\widetilde{A}_{1c}(x^1), -\Big(\frac{1}{\widetilde{e}^2_c}\widetilde{F}_{12c}(y^1)\Big)] &= 2\pi\delta_{cd}\delta(x^1-y^1)\\
[\widetilde{A}_{2c}(x^1), \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}^2_d}(-iB_d(y^1))] &= 2\pi\delta_{cd}\delta(x^1-y^1)\\
\{\widetilde{b}_c(x^1), \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}^2_d}\big(\partial_2\widetilde{c}_d(y^1)\big)\} &= 2\pi\delta_{cd}\delta(x^1-y^1)\\
\{\widetilde{c}_c(x^1), \frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}^2_d}\big(\partial_2\widetilde{b}_d(y^1)\big)\} &= 2\pi\delta_{cd}\delta(x^1-y^1).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.63}$$

The integral form of the supercharge $\hat{Q}_A$ is

$$\hat{Q}_A = \int dx^1(\hat{J}^2_A), \tag{6.64}$$

where $\hat{J}^\mu_A$ is the supercurrent defined via

$$\delta S_E = \int d^2x\partial_\mu\epsilon\hat{J}^\mu_A. \tag{6.65}$$

Its explicit form is[72]

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{Q}_A =&\frac{1}{2\pi}\int dx^1\Big(g_{cd}\partial_2\theta^c(\chi^{\theta d}-\overline{\chi}^{\theta d})-ig_{cd}\partial_1\theta^c(\chi^{\theta d}+\overline{\chi}^{\theta d})-\sum_c^k\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4\widetilde{e}_c^2}\widetilde{F}_{12c}(\widetilde{\psi}_{+c}-\widetilde{\psi}_{-c})\\&-\sum_c^k\frac{i}{\widetilde{e}_c^2}\widetilde{F}_{12c}\partial_1\widetilde{c}_c+\sum_c^k\frac{1}{4\widetilde{e}_c^2}(\widetilde{\lambda}_c+\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_c)\partial_2\widetilde{\varphi}_c+\sum_c^k\frac{i}{4\widetilde{e}_c^2}(\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_c-\widetilde{\lambda}_c)\partial_1\widetilde{\varphi}_c\\&+\frac{1}{4}\sum_c^k(\mathcal{X}_+^{\theta c}+\mathcal{X}_-^{\theta c})\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\theta^c}+\sum_c^k\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}(\widetilde{\psi}_{+c}-\widetilde{\psi}_{-c})\frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{2}{i}\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\widetilde{\varphi}_c}+\frac{1}{4}\frac{\partial\overline{\widetilde{W}}}{\partial\widetilde{\xi}_c}\Big)\\&+\sum_c^k\partial_1\widetilde{c}_c\frac{1}{2i}\Big(\frac{2}{i}\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\widetilde{\varphi}_c}-\frac{1}{4}\frac{\partial\overline{\widetilde{W}}}{\partial\widetilde{\xi}_c}\Big)\\&-\sum_c^k\frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2}\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}B_c(\widetilde{\psi}_{+c}+\widetilde{\psi}_{-c})+\sum_c^k\frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2}B_c\partial_2\widetilde{c}_c+\sum_c^k\frac{i}{4\widetilde{e}_c^2}\partial_2\widetilde{b}_c\widetilde{\varphi}_c\Big),\end{aligned}\tag{6.66}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\theta^c}&=\frac{i}{2}\sum_j^N\langle\widetilde{\varphi},\widetilde{Q}_j\rangle v_c^j-\sum_{j=1}^N v_c^j e^{-\langle v^j,\theta\rangle-\hat{s}^j},\\\frac{2}{i}\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\widetilde{\varphi}_c}&=\sum_j^N\widetilde{Q}_{jc}\Big(\langle v^j,\theta\rangle+\hat{s}^j\Big)-\widetilde{t}_c,\\\frac{1}{4}\frac{\partial\overline{\widetilde{W}}}{\partial\widetilde{\xi}_c}&=\sum_j^N\widetilde{Q}_{jc}\Big(\langle v^j,\overline{\theta}\rangle+\overline{\hat{s}}^j\Big)-\overline{\widetilde{t}}_c\end{aligned}\tag{6.67}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{Q}_A^2=\frac{1}{2}\{\hat{Q}_A,\hat{Q}_A\}=&\frac{1}{2\pi}\int dx^1\Big((-i)\sum_c^k\partial_1\theta^c\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\theta^c}-\sum_c^k\frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2}\widetilde{F}_{12c}\partial_1\widetilde{\varphi}_c+\sum_c^k\frac{1}{2\widetilde{e}_c^2}\widetilde{F}_{12c}\partial_1\widetilde{\varphi}_c\\&+(-i)\sum_c^k\partial_1\widetilde{\varphi}_c\frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\widetilde{\varphi}_c}+\frac{i}{8}\frac{\partial\overline{\widetilde{W}}}{\partial\widetilde{\xi}_c}\Big)-\sum_c^k\big(\frac{i}{4\widetilde{e}_c^2}\big)\partial_2\widetilde{\varphi}_cB_c\\&+(-i)\sum_c^k\partial_1\widetilde{\varphi}_c\frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\widetilde{\varphi}_c}-\frac{i}{8}\frac{\partial\overline{\widetilde{W}}}{\partial\widetilde{\xi}_c}\Big)\\&-\sum_c^k\sum_d^k\frac{\partial^2\overline{\widetilde{W}}}{\partial\overline{\theta}^d\partial\widetilde{\xi}_c}(\chi^{\theta d}-\overline{\chi}^{\theta d})(\frac{i}{8})(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4i}(\widetilde{\psi}_{+c}-\widetilde{\psi}_{-c})+\partial_1\widetilde{c}_c)\Big)\end{aligned}\tag{6.68}$$

where we have used the boundary conditions $\widetilde{F}_{12c}=0$ and $\sum_{c=1}^k v_{cj}\Theta_c=s_j-\hat{s}_j$ (where $s_j=s_j^\pi$ at $x^1=\pi$ and $s_j=s_j^0$ at $x^1=0$), as well as the constraint $\sum_j^N\widetilde{Q}_{jc}s_j-\widetilde{t}_c=0$.

Now, the second and third terms cancel, and this is related to the effect of the gauge-fixing procedure which removes the term proportional to $\delta_G(\widetilde{\varphi})$ in $\delta_{Q_A}^2$. Next, the terms

[72]Charge conservation follows from $\partial_2\hat{Q}_A=\int dx^1\partial_2\hat{J}_A^2=-\int dx^1\partial_1\hat{J}_A^1$, which can be shown to be zero using the boundary conditions we have previously imposed on the fields, as well as the boundary condition $\partial_1\widetilde{b}_c=0$.

proportional to $\frac{\partial\overline{\widetilde{W}}}{\partial\widetilde{\xi}_c}$ cancel. Then, the remaining terms with first-order derivatives of the superpotential can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{(-i)}{2\pi}\int dx^1\Big(\sum_c^k \partial_1\theta^c\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\theta^c}+\sum_c^k\partial_1\widetilde{\varphi}_c\frac{\partial\widetilde{W}}{\partial\widetilde{\varphi}_c}\Big)\\
=&\frac{(-i)}{2\pi}\int dx^1\partial_1\widetilde{W}(\theta,\widetilde{\varphi})\\
=&\frac{(-i)}{2\pi}(\widetilde{W}(\theta,\widetilde{\varphi})_\pi-\widetilde{W}(\theta,\widetilde{\varphi})_0).
\end{aligned}\tag{6.69}$$

From the analysis below (5.96), we know that this is equal to $\frac{(-i)}{2\pi}(\sum_{i=1}^N e^{-s_i^\pi}-\sum_{i=1}^N e^{-s_i^0})$.

The remaining terms to consider are then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\int dx^1\Big(-\sum_c^k(\frac{i}{4\widetilde{e}_c^2})\partial_2\widetilde{\varphi}_cB_c-\sum_c^k\sum_d^k\frac{\partial^2\overline{\widetilde{W}}}{\partial\overline{\theta}^d\partial\widetilde{\xi}_c}(\chi^{\theta d}-\overline{\chi}^{\theta d})(\frac{i}{8})(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4i}(\widetilde{\psi}_{+c}-\widetilde{\psi}_{-c})+\partial_1\widetilde{c}_c)\Big).\tag{6.70}$$

Unlike (6.69), these cannot be written in terms of boundary data, and hence are bulk terms which occur even for closed worldsheets. However, as in the non-anomalous closed case, these bulk terms ought to be equal to zero since it is known that sphere bubbling is a phenomenon that occurs in codimension two and therefore does not obstruct integration over the moduli space [36]. The vanishing of these terms can also be understood as follows. The auxiliary field B_c obeys its equation of motion $B_c=-\frac{i}{2}\partial_\mu\widetilde{A}_c^\mu$ as an operator equation due to Ehrenfest's theorem, and hence the matrix elements of the first term in the integrand with respect to the physical Hilbert space vanish due to the Lorentz gauge condition (6.52).[73] Next, note that we are dealing with an A-twisted theory, whose topological correlation functions are invariant under $\hat{Q}_A$-exact deformations of the action. Therefore, we should be able to deform the action such that the second term in (6.70) vanishes. Indeed, this can be achieved by adding the following term which is $\hat{Q}_A$-exact to the action, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\hat{Q}_A}\Big[\frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2x\frac{1}{2}\Big(\sum_c^k i\widetilde{\lambda}_c\Big(\sum_j^N\widetilde{Q}_{jc}(\sum_d v_d^j\overline{\theta}^d+\overline{\widetilde{s}}^j)-\overline{\widetilde{t}}_c\Big)+\sum_c^k 4\widetilde{\xi}_c\Big(\sum_j^N\sum_d^k\widetilde{Q}_{jc}v_d^j\overline{\chi}_d\Big)\Big)\Big]\\
=&\frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2x\frac{1}{2}\Big(\sum_j^N\sum_c^k\sum_d^k\widetilde{Q}_{jc}v_d^j(4\widetilde{\xi}_c\overline{E}_d^\theta-i\widetilde{\lambda}_c\overline{\chi}_d^\theta-i\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_c\chi_d^\theta+(\widetilde{D}_c+\widetilde{F}_{12c})\overline{\theta}_d)\\
&+\sum_c^k(\sum_j^N\widetilde{Q}_{jc}\overline{\widetilde{s}}^j-\overline{\widetilde{t}}_c)(\widetilde{D}_c+\widetilde{F}_{12c})\Big),
\end{aligned}\tag{6.71}$$

which upon doing so, the terms proportional to $\partial\overline{\widetilde{W}}(\overline{\theta},\widetilde{\xi})/\partial\widetilde{\xi}_c$ in (6.66) vanish, whence the second term in (6.70) also vanishes.

[73] This statement follows from the fact that the Lorentz gauge condition can equivalently be written as $\partial_\mu(\widetilde{A}_c^\mu)^+|\psi\rangle=0$ or $\langle\psi|\partial_\mu(\widetilde{A}_c^\mu)^-=0$ (where $\widetilde{A}_c^\mu=(\widetilde{A}_c^\mu)^++(\widetilde{A}_c^\mu)^-$ is the decomposition with respect to positive and negative momenta), as well as the fact that $\partial_\mu\widetilde{A}_c^\mu$ commutes with $\partial_2\widetilde{\sigma}_c$.

Hence, we find that

$$\hat{Q}_A^2 = \frac{(-i)}{2\pi}(\widetilde{W}(\theta,\widetilde{\varphi})_\pi - \widetilde{W}(\theta,\widetilde{\varphi})_0), \tag{6.72}$$

i.e., the $\hat{Q}_A^2 \neq 0$ anomaly (which occurs due to the nonpertubative quantum effects of open symplectic vortices in the open gauged A-model) vanishes when the value of the superpotential $\widetilde{W}(\theta,\widetilde{\varphi})$ is equal on both boundaries, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^N e^{-s_i^\pi} = \sum_{i=1}^N e^{-s_i^0}$. In other words, there is no anomaly when each boundary ends on a D0-brane such that both D0-branes are mapped to the same value of $\widetilde{W}(\theta,\widetilde{\varphi})$. One way this can occur is when the boundaries end on *coincident* D0-branes. The condition $\sum_{i=1}^N e^{-s_i^\pi} = \sum_{i=1}^N e^{-s_i^0}$ is identical to the condition (found by Hori [8, 27]) for the vanishing of the $Q_A^2 \neq 0$ anomaly (which occurs due to the effects of open worldsheet instantons) of the open A-model; the difference is that the bulk superpotential in that case only depended on θ, the critical point condition on the D0-branes in our case is generalized to (5.104), and the position of each D0-brane (defined by s_i via (5.95)) is in our case constrained by $\mathcal{Q}_a^i s_i - t_a = 0$ instead of just $\hat{Q}_b^i s_i - \hat{t}_b = 0$. In conclusion, for abelian G, we have found that for a pair of G-invariant Lagrangian tori of a toric manifold supporting flat G-equivariant $U(1)$ bundles, the quantum anomaly of $\hat{Q}_A^2 \neq 0$ vanishes if and only if the values of the superpotential $\widetilde{W}(\theta,\widetilde{\varphi})$ on the mirror B-branes are the same. In this case, supersymmetry is manifest, and integration over the moduli space of open symplectic vortices is unobstructed.

6.5 Mirror Computation of Abelian Invariants

In principle, it is simpler to use the mirror gauged Landau-Ginzburg description of the open gauged A-model to compute open Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants for abelian gauge groups, since there are no open symplectic vortices in this gauged LG model.

We shall focus on the mirror computation of invariants that come from path integrals over the Q_A-invariant *local* observables associated with equivariant cohomology classes, i.e., those given by (6.14) (where $d_G\alpha = 0$) and (6.25) (where $d_G\zeta = 0$).[74] After integrating out the auxiliary fields, the supersymmetry transformations (generated by $\hat{Q}_A$) of the physical fields of the mirror theory on a Euclidean worldsheet parametrized by complex coordinates $(z,\overline{z})$ are (with $\epsilon = \sqrt{2}$)[75]

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{\hat{Q}_A}\widetilde{A}_{zc} &= \widetilde{\psi}_{zc} + i\sqrt{2}\partial_z\widetilde{c}_c & \delta_{\hat{Q}_A}\widetilde{\psi}_{zc} &= -\partial_z\widetilde{\varphi}_c \\
\delta_{\hat{Q}_A}\widetilde{A}_{\bar{z}c} &= \widetilde{\psi}_{\bar{z}c} + i\sqrt{2}\partial_{\bar{z}}\widetilde{c}_c & \delta_{\hat{Q}_A}\widetilde{\psi}_{\bar{z}c} &= -\partial_{\bar{z}}\widetilde{\varphi}_c \\
\delta_{\hat{Q}_A}\widetilde{\varphi}_c &= 0 & \delta_{\hat{Q}_A}\widetilde{\eta}_c &= 0 \\
\delta_{\hat{Q}_A}\widetilde{\xi}_c &= \widetilde{\eta}_c & \delta_{\hat{Q}_A}\widetilde{\kappa}_c &= 2[*\widetilde{F}_{Ac} - \widetilde{e}_c^2(-i\partial_{\widetilde{\varphi}_c}\widetilde{W} + (1/8)\partial_{\widetilde{\xi}_c}\overline{\widetilde{W}})] \\
\delta_{\hat{Q}_A}\theta^c &= 0 & \delta_{\hat{Q}_A}\mathcal{X}_z^{\theta c} &= -2\sqrt{2}i\,\partial_z\theta^c \\
\delta_{\hat{Q}_A}\overline{\theta}^c &= \sqrt{2}(\chi^{\theta c} - \overline{\chi}^{\theta c}) & \delta_{\hat{Q}_A}\mathcal{X}_{\bar{z}}^{\theta c} &= 2\sqrt{2}i\,\partial_{\bar{z}}\theta^c
\end{aligned}$$

[74] Note that the G-invariance of these physical observables implies that they are invariant under Q_{BRST}, and therefore also invariant under $\hat{Q}_A$.

[75] The fermionic fields $\widetilde{\eta}_c$ and $\widetilde{\kappa}_c$ are related to the fields $\widetilde{\lambda}_c$ and $\overline{\widetilde{\lambda}}_c$ defined in the previous section via a field redefinition of the form given in (6.34).

$$\delta_{\hat{Q}_A}(\chi^{\theta c} - \overline{\chi}^{\theta c}) \;=\; 0 \qquad\qquad \delta_{\hat{Q}_A}[\, g_{cd}(\chi^{\theta d} + \overline{\chi}^{\theta d})] \;=\; -\sqrt{2}\,\partial_{\theta^c}\widetilde{W}. \tag{6.73}$$

The bulk physical operators of this theory were studied by Baptista [13], where he showed that the bulk chiral ring is given by

$$\mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\varphi}^1, \ldots, \widetilde{\varphi}^k, (x^1)^{\pm 1}, \ldots, (x^k)^{\pm 1}] \;/\; D(\widetilde{W})\ , \tag{6.74}$$

i.e., holomorphic functions of $\widetilde{\varphi}_c$ and $(x^c)^{\pm 1} := \exp(\mp\theta^c)$, modulo the ideal $D(\widetilde{W})$, where $D(\widetilde{W})$ is generated by the derivatives

$$\partial_{\theta^c}\widetilde{W} \;=\; -x^c\,\partial_{x^c}\widetilde{W} \;=\; \sum_{j=1}^{n} \widetilde{Q}_j^c \left[\frac{i}{2}\langle\widetilde{\varphi}, v^j\rangle \;-\; e^{-\hat{s}^j}\prod_{d=1}^{k}(x^d)^{v_d^j}\right]. \tag{6.75}$$

In addition, one ought to restrict the bulk physical operators to finite-degree polynomials, since in the equivariant de Rham complex one only considers finite-degree forms and polynomials in the Lie algebra.

Let us now find the elements of the boundary chiral ring, concentrating first on boundary physical operators which come from the matter multiplets. Now, at each boundary, we know that θ^c and $\overline{\theta}^c$ are constants which determine the position of the mirror D0-brane (see (5.95) and footnote 60). Then, via (6.73), we find that $(\chi^{\theta c} - \overline{\chi}^{\theta c}) = 0$ on each boundary, and thus $\chi^{\theta c} - \overline{\chi}^{\theta c}$ cannot be an operator in the boundary chiral ring. Even θ^c and $\overline{\theta}^c$ cannot be elements of the ring since they are not fields along each boundary; rather, they are constants. On the other hand, $\chi^{\theta c} + \overline{\chi}^{\theta c}$ is a nonzero field at each boundary. Moreover, because of the critical point condition ($\partial_{\theta^c}\widetilde{W} = 0$), $\chi^{\theta c} + \overline{\chi}^{\theta c}$ is $\hat{Q}_A$-invariant. Hence, $\chi^{\theta c} + \overline{\chi}^{\theta c}$ is a valid $\hat{Q}_A$-invariant operator defined on each boundary.

For the non-gauged open A-model [12], the k fermionic fields $\chi^{\theta c} + \overline{\chi}^{\theta c}$ form the boundary chiral ring, and also provide a basis of the de Rham cohomology of the torus A-branes with topology T^k. Hence, for the open gauged A-model, the boundary chiral ring ought to be formed by the k fermionic fields $\chi^{\theta c} + \overline{\chi}^{\theta c}$, as well as the k bosonic fields $\widetilde{\varphi}_c$, since these provide a basis of the *equivariant* de Rham cohomology of a torus A-brane.

Indeed, there are no other valid scalar $\hat{Q}_A$-invariant fields in the vector multiplets which can be elements of the boundary chiral ring. From the boundary condition $(\widetilde{\overline{\lambda}}_{-c} - \widetilde{\lambda}_{+c}) = 0$, we know that $\widetilde{\kappa}_c = 0$ at each boundary, so it cannot be such an operator. The operator $\widetilde{\eta}_c$ is nonzero at each boundary, and is $\hat{Q}_A$-invariant, but its anticommuting behaviour implies that it cannot be associated with equivariant cohomology classes. On the other hand, $\widetilde{\varphi}_c$ is $\hat{Q}_A$-invariant, and obeys a Neumann boundary condition, and as such is a valid bosonic boundary operator. However, note that the possible values that $\widetilde{\varphi}_c$ can take along the boundaries are constrained by the critical point condition ($\partial_{\theta^c}\widetilde{W} = 0$); see (6.75). Thus, an arbitrary element of the boundary chiral ring is denoted as

$$W_{\partial\Sigma}^{mirror} = \mathcal{F}(\widetilde{\varphi}^1, \ldots, \widetilde{\varphi}^k)\left(\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\chi^\theta + \overline{\chi}^\theta)^{c_i}\right) \tag{6.76}$$

where s can take any value from 1 to k, and where $\mathcal{F}$ is a polynomial of finite degree.

Denoting an arbitrary element of the bulk chiral ring (6.74) as W^{mirror}, the most general correlation function of local bulk and boundary observables in the gauged Landau-Ginzburg model is therefore written as

$$\int \mathcal{D}(\widetilde{A},\theta,\widetilde{\varphi},\widetilde{\xi},\widetilde{\eta},\widetilde{\kappa},\widetilde{\psi},\chi^{\theta},\widetilde{b},\widetilde{c})\ \ e^{-(S_A+S_{BRST})}\ \prod_i W_i^{mirror} \prod_j W_{\partial\Sigma|j}^{mirror}\ . \tag{6.77}$$

This is the mirror correlation function which computes (6.27) for local observables. However, not all expressions of this form are nonzero, due to fermion zero modes.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank João Manuel Baptista, Suresh Govindarajan, Yuan Luo, Daniel S. Park, Petr Vaško, Sushmita Venugopalan, Junya Yagi, Masaya Yata and Qin Zhao for helpful comments and discussions. This work is supported by NUS Tier 1 FRC Grant R-144-000-316-112.

References

[1] J. Polchinski, *Dirichlet Branes and Ramond-Ramond Charges*, *Physical Review Letters* **75** (26) (1995) 4724 [arXiv:9510017]

[2] M. Kontsevich, *Homological Algebra of Mirror Symmetry*, in *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians* (Zurich, 1994), Birkhauser, Boston, (1995) 120-139 [arXiv:9411018]

[3] J.M. Baptista, *Twisting Gauged Non-linear Sigma-models*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2** (2008) 096 [arXiv:0707.2786]

[4] D. McDuff, D.A. Salamon, *Introduction to Symplectic Topology*, Oxford University Press, Oxford U.K. (1998)

[5] P. Libermann, and C.-M. Marle, *Symplectic Geometry and Analytical Mechanics*, Springer Science & Business Media (1987)

[6] J.M. Figueroa-O'Farrill and S. Stanciu, *Equivariant Cohomology and Gauged Bosonic Sigma-models, ArXiV High-Energy Physics-Theory e-prints* (July, 1994) [arXiv:hep-th/9407149]

[7] K.L. Yano, *The Theory of Lie Derivatives and its Applications*, North-Holland (1957)

[8] K. Hori et al., *Mirror Symmetry*, Clay Mathematics Monographs **1**, AMS (2003)

[9] E. Witten, *Phases of N= 2 Theories in Two Dimensions*, *Nuclear Physics B* **403** (1) (1993) 159-222 [arXiv:hep-th/9301042]

[10] K. Hori, C. Vafa, *Mirror Symmetry, ArXiV High-Energy Physics-Theory e-prints* (February, 2000) [arXiv:hep-th/0002222]

[11] K. Hori, A. Iqbal, C. Vafa, *D-branes and Mirror Symmetry, ArXiV High-Energy Physics-Theory e-prints* (May, 2000) [arXiv:hep-th/0005247]

[12] K. Hori, *Linear Models of Supersymmetric D-branes*, in *Symplectic Geometry and Mirror Symmetry* (Seoul, 2000) (K. Fukaya et al., eds.), World Scientific, River Edge, NJ (2001) 111-186 [arXiv:hep-th/0012179]

[13] J.M. Baptista, *The Quantum Equivariant Cohomology of Toric Manifolds through Mirror Symmetry*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **4** (2009) 017 [arXiv:0806.2091]

[14] S. Govindarajan, T. Jayaraman, T. Sarkar, *On D-branes from Gauged Linear Sigma Models*, *Nuclear Physics B* **593** (2001) 155-182 [arXiv:hep-th/0007075]

[15] A. Kapustin, K. Setter, K. Vyas, *Surface Operators in Four-dimensional Topological Gauge Theory and Langlands Duality, ArXiV High-Energy Physics-Theory e-prints* (February, 2010) [arXiv:1002.0385]

[16] K. Vyas, *Topics in Topological and Holomorphic Quantum Field Theory* (Doctoral dissertation, California Institute of Technology, 2010)

[17] K. Setter, *Topological Quantum Field Theory and the Geometric Langlands Correspondence* (Doctoral dissertation, California Institute of Technology, 2013)

[18] M.B. Green, J.H. Schwarz, E. Witten, *Superstring Theory: Volume 2, Loop Amplitudes, Anomalies and Phenomenology*, Cambridge University Press (2012)

[19] A. Abouelsaood, C. G. Callan, C. R. Nappi, S. A. Yost, *Open Strings In Background Gauge Fields, Nuclear Physics B* **280** (1987) 599

[20] P.S. Aspinwall, *D-branes on Calabi-Yau Manifolds,* in *Progress in String Theory: TASI 2003* (J. Maldacena, ed.), World Scientific (2005) 1-152 [arXiv:hep-th/0403166]

[21] N. Berline, E. Getzler, M. Vergne, *Heat Kernels and Dirac Operators*, Springer Science and Business Media (1992)

[22] R.J. Szabo, *Equivariant Cohomology and Localization of Path Integrals*, Springer Science and Business Media (2003)

[23] M. Herbst, K. Hori, D. Page, *Phases of N= 2 Theories in 1+ 1 Dimensions with Boundary, ArXiV High-Energy Physics-Theory e-prints* (March, 2008) [arXiv:0803.2045]

[24] S. Cautis, J Kamnitzer, *Knot Homology via Derived Categories of Coherent Sheaves, I: The* $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$*-case, Duke Mathematical Journal* **142** (3) (2008) 511-588 [arXiv:math/0701194]

[25] P. Aspinwall et al., *Dirichlet Branes and Mirror Symmetry*, Clay Mathematics Monographs **4**, AMS (2009)

[26] C.H. Cho, H. Hong, *Finite Group Actions on Lagrangian Floer Theory, ArXiV Mathematics e-prints* (July, 2013) [arXiv:1307.4573]

[27] K. Hori, *Mirror Symmetry and Quantum Geometry*, in *Proceedings of ICM 2002, Vol. III* (T. Li, ed.), Higher Education Press, Beijing (2002) 431-443 [arXiv:0207068]

[28] A. Kapustin, Y. Li, *D-branes in Landau-Ginzburg Models and Algebraic Geometry*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **12** (2003) 005 [arXiv:0210296]

[29] K. Cieliebak, A.R. Gaio, D.A. Salamon, *J-holomorphic Curves, Moment Maps, and Invariants of Hamiltonian Group Actions*, *International Mathematics Research Notices* **16** (2000) 831-832 [arXiv:math/9909122]

[30] I. Mundet i Riera, *Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten Invariants*, *Topology* **42** (2003) 525-553 [arXiv:math/0002121]

[31] K. Cieliebak, A.R. Gaio, I. Mundet i Riera, D.A. Salamon, *The Symplectic Vortex Equations and Invariants of Hamiltonian Group Actions*, *Journal of Symplectic Geometry* **1** (3) (2002) 543-646 [arXiv:math/0111176]

[32] A.R. Gaio, D.A. Salamon, *Gromov-Witten Invariants of Symplectic Quotients and Adiabatic Limits*, *Journal of Symplectic Geometry* **3** (2005) 55-159 [arXiv:math/0106157]

[33] G. Xu, *The Moduli Space of Twisted Holomorphic Maps with Lagrangian Boundary Condition: Compactness*, *Advances in Mathematics* **242** (2013) 1-49 [arXiv:math/1202.4096]

[34] P.V. Georgieva, *Orientability of Moduli Spaces and Open Gromov-Witten Invariants* (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 2011)

[35] G. Xu, *Gauged Hamiltonian Floer Homology I: Definition of the Floer Homology Groups*, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **368** (4) (2016) 2967-3015 [arXiv:math/1312.6923]

[36] D. McDuff, D.A. Salamon, *J-holomorphic Curves and Symplectic Topology*, American Mathematical Society (2012)